AD-A118 853 ARMY WAR COLL CARLISLE BARRACKS PA F/6 5/9 OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS OF THE DA STATECT(U) JUN 82 P T METRACH UNCLASSIFIED NL

AD A118853

· 在下下 2000年 1000年 1000年

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ DISTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
AD-A11885	<u> </u>
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Optimal Length of Assignment of PPBES Programmers on the DA Staff	Study Project
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT HUMBER
7. AUTHOR(a) Paul T. Weyrauch, Lieutenant Colonel USA	S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army War College	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013	anen e wern en,
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	June 1982
Same .	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	Unclassified
	154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	<u> </u>
Approved for public release; distribution unlimi	ted
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in Block 20, it different fro	en Report)
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number,	,
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)	
The purpose of the study was to determine to for officers assigned to the DA staff as programming, Programming, Budgeting, and the Execution complexity and dynamics of the PPBES, the effort long officers remained assigned to programming by their reassignment, to determine how long officers	the optimal tour length mers in the DOD Plan- System (PPBES). Given the was to determine how illets and reasons for rs should be assigned to
programming billets, and to determine whether or	not attainment of that

SD 1 JAN 79 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THE PASE (Then Date Butere

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PASE(When Date Beleved)

Item 20. (Continued)

such as 05/06 level command or attendance at senior service colleges.

Data on which to base the study were generated by questionnaires sent to 197 past and present programmers; 164 useable responses were received. An analysis of the data revealed the uniqueness of the programmer's job and the requirements to stabilize PPBES programmer's tours for 24-30 months and to only assign specially screened and motivated officers who have 12-18 months experience as action officers on the DA staff.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Bete Mintered)

Acces	sion For									
	GRALI	X								
DIIC		<u>"ם</u> "								
	ounced fication									
Justi	04561110411011									
Ву										
	ibution/									
Aval	lability	Codes								
	Avail and									
Dist	Special	l j								
1										
IH										

THE DISTRIBUTION OUTHER SENDE TO OTHER DODACTIVETS
DOES NOT CONSTITUTIBLE AGE ATTERMY PREFAIR TO DED
DIR 5200 20. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENTS STATEME AL
DECRETHS 24 SEP 70. THE US ACTIVED TO LOTHER AND AND THE SOMEOLING SUPPRESS APPOINT OF THE US ARMY WAS DECRETED IT
CHANGE IS CUTTO ON BUILDING DESCRIPTION WITHOUTHE
BEPRESS APPOINT OF THE US ARMY WAR DIVISOR.

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE

MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER



OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON THE DA STAFF

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL PAUL T. WEYRADCH FIELD ARTILLERY

3 JUNE 1982

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Delenae or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open published until it has been cleared by the georegists military service or government agent

THELE OF CONTINUES

 $\mathcal{L}_{i} = \mathcal{L}_{i} + \mathcal{L}_{i}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{i} = \mathcal{L}_{i} + \mathcal{L}_{i}$

 $\varphi = (-1)^{n} \cdot (-1)^$

						-
						Page
list of	TABLES	• .	•	•	• •	iii
list of	PIGURES		•	•	•	iv
ABSTRACT			•	•	• •	
PREFACE	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	•	•		vii
ACKNOWLE	DGEMENT		•	•		viii
Chapter						
I.	INTRODUCTION	•	•	•	•	1
	Limitations of the Study	• •	•	•	• •	, 3
II.	METHODOLOGY Population Questionnaire Development Analysis Procedure	•	• •	•	•	. 6
III.	RESPONSES	•	• •	•	•	. 8
IV.	DATA ANALYSES AND FINDINGS Observations on Frequency Listing Comparison of Subgroup Means and Frequencies Optimal Tour Lengths Stability in PPBES vs. Reassignment Other Subjective Opinions of Respondents	B	• •	•	•	15 11 18 21
	Voluntary Comments of Respondents	•	• •	•	•	. 28
v.	CONCLUSIONS	•		•	•	. 31 . 31 . 31
327	DECMARKETARITANS					22

Appendix

1.	QUESTIONNAIRE	34
2.	NARRATIVE COMMENTS	46
3.	FREQUENCY LISTING OF RESPONSES	58
4.	REASONS FOR DEPARTURE FROM PERES BILLET - DETAILS ON "OTHER" ASSIGNMENTS	L 6 3
5.	OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTH - MEANS TO MONTHS CONVERSION TABLE	L Ø 5
NICIPIE	MITTEN	1 8 6

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	8
2	SELECTED PREQUENCIES BY SUBGROUP	3-17
3	SUBGROUP MEANS FOR OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTES	26
4	RECOMMENDED OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTHS (MONTHS)	20
5	SUBGROUP MEANS FOR ASSIGNMENT PRIORITIES	23
6	RECOMMENDED PRIORITY OF ASSIGNMENT	23
7	ASSIGNMENT PRIORITY - COMPARISON OF EXTREME RESPONSES	24
8	SUBGROUP MEANS FOR SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS	26
9	SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS - AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT STATEMENTS	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure								Page
1	QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT TO DE OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTH		• • • •		• •	•	• •	19
2	QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT TO DE ASSIGNMENT PRIORITY	TEMDE	.47	• • •		•		22
3	QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT FOR S	UBJECTIVE	OPINIONS	• •		•		25

· (,,

AUTHOR: Paul T. Weyrauch, LTC, FA

TITLE: Optimal Length of Assignment of PPBES

Programmers on the DA Staff

FORMAT: USAWC Military Studies Program

DATE: 3 June 1982 PAGES: 106 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The purpose of the study was to determine the optimal tour length for officers assigned to the DA staff as programmers in the DOD Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System (PPRES). Given the complexity and dynamics of the PPRES, the effort was to determine how long officers remained assigned to programming billets and reasons for their reassignment, to determine how long officers should be assigned to programming billets, and to determine whether or not attainment of that optimal tour length should take priority over assignment to key positions such as 05/06 level command or attendance at senior service colleges.

Data on which to base the study were generated by questionnaires sent to 197 past and present programmers; 164 useable responses were received. An analysis of the data revealed the uniqueness of the programmer's job and the requirements to stabilize PPBES programmer's tours for 24-30 months and to only assign specially screened and motivated officers who have 12-18 months experience as action officers on the DA staff.

PREFACE

This Individual Military Study Program effort was produced under the aegis of the Department of Command and Management, US Army War College. The basis for the study is the author's interest which developed following his fourteen month tour as an action officer in the Program and Budget Office, ODCSOPS, HODA from January 1977 to March 1978. The study effort is designed to make a positive contribution to improving the way the Army manages its part of the DOD PPBES.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This military study program report would not be complete without acknowledging the superb assistance of the following individuals and offices without whose support the author would still be at Square 1:

Mrs. Charles R. Weaver, JASA Branch, Officer Personnel Directorate, MILPERCEN Computer Systems Support Branch, US Army War College Reprographics Division, US Army War College Word Processing Center, US Army War College

Special thanks and recognition are due Dr. Donald D. Penner, Director of Operations Research, US Army War College for his longsuffering and patient instruction.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement Of The Problem

Highly qualified officers assigned to the Department of the Army

(DA) staff as programmers in the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting

Execution System (PPBES) are frequently reassigned to other key jobs

after less than optimal tour lengths resulting in loss of efficiency and

effectiveness in the development and execution of the Army's programs.

Background

Simplistically stated, the PPBES is a DOD decisionmaking process designed to identify military requirements necessary to support national objectives (planning), merge those requirements with projected resource; over a five year program (programming), translate those programs into budget requests for resource appropriation by the Congress (budgeting), and finally, execute the approved budget (execution). This process is a dynamic one due to many factors. Changing world and domestic situations, the potential for rapid turnover in the executive and legislative branches of the government brought about by constitutionally required elections, and the internal personnel management policies of our military departments all tend to work against the existence of a coherent process. Indeed, it would appear that the possibility of a single five year defense program (FYDP) being carried through to completion is

doomed from the start. Given th: the military departments, specifically the Army, can do little or nothing to manage the world or domestic environment and that there is no possibility of modifying the constitutionally mandated terms of the executive and legislative members, it is nonetheless appropriate to determine if internal Army procedures might be changed to improve the manner in which we execute the PPBES. Thus, the purpose of this study was to isolate a particular function, i.e. programming, to determine if the Army is gaining optimal benefit from those officers assigned to programming billets in the DA staff.

A key measure in making such a determination deals with the length of time DA staff officers serve in such billets. Assignment turbulence is a major problem throughout the Army. In many positions, especially those which require a high level of content and/or process expertise and which are relatively unique among normal assignments (i.e., where the skills, knowledge, and abilities must be learned on the job), personnel turbulence is a major limiting factor in job success.

One such class of positions is that of DA staff PPBES programmer. Officers filling these positions must learn an extremely complex process as well as develop the relevant content knowledge within the functional area of their respective assignments. Typically, officers assigned to programming positions are highly selected and among the "best and the brightest" members of the officer corps. Thus, they are "vulnerable" to selection for military and civilian schooling, promotion, command assignments, and more prestigious staff assignments.

The uniqueness and complexity of the DA staff PPBES programmers' jobs combine to increase the time required to learn the job and to become fully effective. The "high quality" of individuals sought for

these positions and the concomitant vulnerability to reassignment increase the rate of position turnover. The result of these factors may be less than optimal productivity and effectiveness.

The magnitude of these factors and potential solutions were unknown. This study was an attempt to estimate these magnitudes and to generate a set of feasible recommendations to deal with the problem of turbulence among DA staff PPBES programmers.

The study effort required assignment experience data and subjective opinions of action officers previously and currently assigned to DA PPRES programmer billets. This information was not available from DA staff offices or from MILPERCEN. Thus, direct contact with action officers was required.

Limitations Of The Study

Clearly, this study addressed but a small part of the total package. Findings and recommendations must be reviewed in light of their interrelationships with other facets of the PPBES. Subsequent efforts should look at management of planning and budgeting billets as well as ways to improve the integration of these functions.

Despite significant limitations and its narrow scope, it is nonetheless intended as a step in the right direction toward solution of a major problem.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Population

For purposes of this study, DA staff PPBES programmers were considered to be officers assigned to one of the following offices.

- 1. Program Development Division (PDD), Program Analysis and Evaluation Directorate, Office of the Chief of Staff (PAED, OCSA).
- 2. Manpower and Force Program Analysis Division (MAFPAD), PAED, OCSA.
- 3. Acquisition Support Program Analysis Division (ASPAD), PAED, OCSA.
 - 4. Resource Management Review Division (RMRD), PAED, OCSA,
- 5. Information Resources Management Division (IRMD), PAED, OCSA.
 - 6. Program and Budget Division, ODCSPER.
 - 7. Program and Budget Office, ODCSOPS.
 - 8. Programs and Management Division, ODCSLOG.
 - 9. Program Coordination Team, ODCSRDA.

Selection of these offices was based on their clearly identifiable functions of preparation, consolidation, evaluation, and review and analysis of programming documents. It is recognized that there are other designated billets throughout the staff which deal in programming

matters and further, that virtually every action officer deals directly or indirectly with programming issues. Exclusion of such personnel was a conscious decision by the author based on the time available for the study. Note: The newly created Planning and Integration Division of Strategy Plans & Policy Directorate, ODCSOPS, was not included in this effort, but should be in future studies based on its designed function of integrating planning and programming. Although it was not included as an identifiable element in this study, input from present members of the office was obtained based on their experience in several of the other offices listed.

The target population for the study was determined to be officers assigned to the offices listed from 1976 to the present. Such a population would be large enough to provide meaningful information across a spectrum of time in service, grades, branches, etc., as well as providing indicators of attitudes under various administrations and military supervisors. Thus, the entire population of approximately 298 officers was queried to provide both objective and subjective data.

Identification of respondents was done thru review of organizational charts for each of the offices listed and by rosters made available by those offices. Current addresses were then obtained from a series of sources including:

- 1. Register of Alumni, USAWC
- 2. Biographical sketches of current students at all SSC
- 3. Register of graduates, USMA
- 4. Telephone directories for Northern VA & Suburban ND
- 5. MILPERCEN JASA Division, OPPD

<u>Ovestionnaire Development</u>

In order to obtain the required information, a questionnaire was developed which was intended to accomplish the following,

- 1. To determine how long officers remained assigned to programming billets and reason for their reassignment. Related data included basic year group, years of assignment and departure, rank on assignment and departure, assignment control branch, primary and alternate specialties, highest level schooling prior to assignment, and highest level of command prior to assignment. Data were analyzed using SPSS to determine if significant factors existed for those officers who were reassigned.
- 2. To determine how long officers should be assigned to programming billets. An analysis of subjective opinions of respondents regarding optimal tour length for officers assigned to their office was conducted. Questionnaire discriminated concerning prior experience with PPRES at various levels of command,
- 3. To determine whether or not attainment of the optimal tour length should take priority over assignment to key positions such as command or senior service colleges. Analysis of subjective opinion of respondents compared their background and experience to determine significant factors.

The questionnaire was developed with the assistance of Dr. Donald D. Penner, Director of Operations Research, USAWC and approved by Soldier Support Center IAW AR 688-46, 1 November 1978. A cupy of the questionnaire and answer sheet is at Appendix 1.

Analysis Procedure

The primary basis of analysis was the IBM SPSS package as converted by the University of Kansas Academic Computer Center. The package was run on the USAWC Honeywell Series 6868. Computer analyses of the data were then combined with written input from the respondents to develop conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER III

RESPONSES

Following approval of the questionnaire and a cover letter signed by the Cofs, USAWC, the questionnaire was mailed to respondents on 19 March 1982 with a suspense of 7 April 1982. Response was excellent with results as shown in Table 1.

OUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

<u>Office</u>	<u>#Mailed</u>	#Responses	#Useable Responses	*Useable Responses
POD, PAED	26	22	21	81%
MAFPAD, PAED	42	38	37	884
ASPAD, PAED	28	23	23	82%
RIND, PAED	11	16	16	918
IRMD, PAED	4	4	4	1996
PLB Div, ODCSPER	15	14	13	87%
Pab Off, ODCSOPS	38	32	31	824
PEN DIV, ODCSLOG	13	8	8	624
Prog Coord Im, ODCSRDA	28	18	17	85%
TOTAL	197	169	164	83%

NOTE: Figures Do not include:

Three questionnaires returned due to incorrect addresses.

One question returned without action - officer stated he had had no programming experience.

One answer sheet not used due to unresolvable coding errors.

TABLE 1

Of the 164 responses, 83 included additional comments concerning pros and cons of PPBES assignments, views on learning the job, ideas on job stability, and adequacy of the questionnaire itself. The essence of the comments is synthesized at Appendix 2.

Use of the OPSCAN answer sheet by the respondents resulted in coding errors on roughly 23% of the answer sheets. Errors were caused by skipping columns, darkening the incorrect row (e.g., filling in "O" rather than "l"), or by misinterpreting the instructions. Once these errors showed up on the preliminary computer run, they were corrected by the author thru a cross check procedure inherent in the design of the questionnaire (albeit an unintentional bit of serendipity . . .)

Of a more significant nature, however, was a typographical error on the questionnaire which was undetected prior to mailing. The error resulted in two "strongly disagree" columns in the questionnaire heading for questions 36-46. The error in column 5, which should read "strongly agree" was positively commented on by 65 respondents (39.6%) thru such actions as making a notation on the questionnaire which was returned with the answer sheet or by making a note on the optional remarks page or the answer sheet itself. Although the balance of responses contain no direct evidence that the error was detected, the nature of the responses to the questions of concern are in keeping with the expected response and thereby indirectly suggest that the error was in fact noted and the answers indicated accordingly. Thus, while the error carried great potential for invalidating the data for questions 36-46, it is concluded that the error was in fact detected by most, if not all respondents. The data are therefore considered valid.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

Observations on Frequency Listing

Analysis began with a review of the frequency breakout of responses of the total population for each question. A copy of the frequency listing is at Appendix 3. General comments pertaining to the 164 respondents are as follows:

- 1. Basic year groups ranged from 1952 to 1977 with almost 50% (81) in year groups 61, 62, 63, and 64.
- 2. Approximately 58% (95) were assigned to the divisions of PAED with the balance assigned to offices within ODCSPER, ODCSOPS, ODCSLOG, or ODCSRDA.
- 3. Calendar year of arrival of officers varied from 1973 to 1982. Fourteen percent (23) were assigned prior to 1976 and less than 2% (3) in 1982.
- 4. 92.7% (152) were MAJ or LTC at the time they reported for duty; there were 4.3% (7) CPTs and 3% (5) COLs.
- 5. 48.2% (79) were combat arms, 21.3% (35) were combat support, and 38.5% (58) were combat service support.
- 6. 44.5% (73) carried a primary specialty of IN, FP, or ENGR; the remaining 55.5% were spread over 28 primary specialties.
- 7. 28.7% (34) were comptrollers as their other specialty and 34.1% (56) were CRSA; the balance of 45.2% were spread over 17 other

specialties.

- 8. 32.94 (54) had commanded at the O5 level prior to reporting for duty; of the remaining 118 officers, 183 (62.84 or total) had commanded at O3/O4 level.
 - 9. 93.9% (154) had completed CGSC or the equivalent.
 - 18. 14.1% (23) had completed SSC level schooling.
- 11. 35.6% (58) served as branch or team chiefs during their assignment.

The following data pertain to the 121 officers who had already departed or who had firm departure dates from the DA staff at the time they completed the questionnaire:

- 1. 58 (48%) of the 121 were assigned for two years or less; indeed, 32 (26%) stayed 18 months or less. 42 (35%) remained between two and three years, and 21 (17%) stayed beyond three years.
- 44 (36%) departed during the 1977-79 time frame, and 72
 (60%) during the 1980-82 time period.
- 3. 36 (38%) departed to command, 17 (14%) to attend CGSC or SSC level schooling, and 19 (16%) to assignment in OSD, OJCS, or other DA staff/Army secretariat positions. Seven (6%) retired or resigned, and 48 (33%) went to a variety of other assignments (Appendix 4).

Comparison of Subgroup Means and Prequencies

The next step in the data analysis entailed a comparison of frequency data and means for the following eight groupings of the 164 respondents:

- 1. PAE vs. Non PAE
- 2. Combat Arms vs. Combat Support vs. Combat Service Support
- 3. Other specialty 45 vs. 49 vs. all others

- 4. Highest level of command at 01-04 vs. 05 commanders
- 5. Still assigned vs. those who remained two years or less vs. two to three years vs. more than three years
- 6. Reported as 03/04 vs. reported as 04(P)-06
- 7. Departed in 1976-79 vs. 1986-82 vs. still assigned
- 8. Highest job as AO vs. highest job as branch/team chief The comparison yielded the following observations (see Table 2):
- 1. While 34.1% of the 164 respondents possess ORSA (49) as their other specialty, 47.4% of PAED officers carry ORSA as their other specialty against 15.9% of non-PAED officers.
- 2. Of the 79 combat arms officers who responded, 45.6% had 05 level command experience when they reported vs. 25.7% of the 35 combat support officers, and 18.0% of the 50 combat service support types.
- 3. Of the 54 officers with O5 level command experience when they reported, 65.9% departed in two years or less (36.4% in 18 months or less). 32.6% of the 54 left their PPBES to attend senior service schools (population mean of 14.3%).
- 4. Of the 58 officers who departed in two years or les:,
 54.4% went to command or military schooling; for the 42 who stayed in
 the PPBES job for 2-3 years, 47.6% went to command or military schooling.
- 5. 93 officers arrived with the rank of MAJ(P) COL. Of these, 57% had commanded at the O5 level and 24.7% had attended SSC.

 Almost 69% of the 93 stayed two years or less (37.5% stayed 18 months or less).
- 6. Comparison of departure periods reveals that of the 47 officers who left in 1976-79, 51.1% went in two years or less; 42.6% of the 47 went to command, and 29.8% of the 47 went to "other" assignments.

TABLE OF SELECTED PREQUENCIES BY SUBGROUP

 -			SECTION	LON	REPORTED	RTED	CONTROL		BRANCH	OTHER	t I	SPECIALTY
ð	QUESTION	ALL	PAE	NON	CFT	MAJ(F) COL	V O	SS	CSS	45	4 9	OTHER
NXX	Combat Arms Combat Support Combat Service Support	48.2 21.3 30.5	45.3 27.4 27.4	52.2 13.0 34.8	40.8 29.5 29.6	53.8 15.1 31.2	111	1.1.1	1 1 1	32.4 20.6 47.0	53.6 26.8 19.7	47.3
××	% ORSA (49) as other specialty % Compt (45) as other specialty	34.1 20.7	47.4 10.5	15.9 34.8	31.0 26.8	36.6 16.1	38.0 17.7	42.9 11.4	22.0 32.0	• •	• •	• •
×	% 05 cond exp prior to report	32.9	29.5	37.7	1.4	57.0	45.6	25.7	18.0	23.5	35.7	35.1
10 X	SSC compl prior to report	14.1	14.7	13.2	•	24.7	19.0	11.4	8.2	15.2	14.3	13.5
ZXXX	Spent 18 months or less Spent 24 months or less Spent 24-36 months Spent more than 36 months	26.4 47.9 34.7 17.4	27.3 53.0 33.3 13.6	25.5 41.8 36.4 21.8	10.2 30.6 46.9 22.4	37.5 59.7 26.4 13.9	32.8 45.9 34.4 19.7	16.0 48.0 28.0 24.0	22.9 51.4 40.0 8.6	13.0 25.0 40.0 35.0	2344 2044 2049	30.0 55.0 28.3 16.7
*XX	AO as highest job held Mr/Tm Chief as highest job held	64.4 35.6	75.8 24.2	48.5	78.9	53.3	61.5 38.5	71.4 28.6	64.0 36.0	48.5 51.6	69.6 30.3	67.6 32.4
NXXXX HILLED	Departed for 05/06 comd Departed for CGSC/SSC Departed for DA/Sec/OSD/OJCS Retired/resigned	30.3 14.3 16.0 5.9 33.6	30.8 12.3 18.5 7.7 30.8	29.1 16.4 12.7 3.6 36.4	37.5 4.2 18.8 2.1 37.5	25.0 20.8 13.9 8.3	30.5 16.9 16.9 8.5	32.0 16.0 34.0 32.0	28.6 14.3 12.9 45.7	220000	31.7 17.1 14.6 24.2	なけた か ながら な できない
81.	Sise of subgroup	164	95	69	71	93	79	35	50	×	26	72

TABLE OF SELECTED FREQUENCIES BY SUBGROUP

<u></u>			COMD EXP	HIGHEST	ဒြ	H TIME	IN	PPBES	JOB	YEAR	DEPARTED	TED
<u> </u>	8	QUESTION	01-04 05	Ψ0	BR/TM CHIEF	STILL	75	× × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×	>3	61-91	80-82	STILL ASGD
!	2	% Combat Arms % Combat Support % Combat Service Support	39.1 66. 23.6 16. 37.3 16.	7 45.7 7 23.8 7 30.5	51.7 17.2 31.0	41.9 23.3 34.9	48.3 20.7 31.0	50.0 16.7 33.3	57.1 28.6 14.3	44.7 23.4 31.9	52.8 19.5 27.8	44.4 22.2 33.3
	7	K ORSA (49) as other specialty K Compt (45) as other specialty	32.7 37.0 23.6 14.8	0 37.1 8 15.2	29.3 29.3	34.9 32.6	34.5 8.6	40.5	19.0 33.3	23.4	41.7	33.3
<u> </u>	8	% 05 comd exp prior to report	•	22.9	50.0	23.3	50.0	26.2	19.0	34.0	37.5	24.4
	9	% 9SC compl prior to report	0.0 40.	7 5.8	22.6	9.3	22.4	9.5	10.0	13.0	18.1	8.9
14	=	% Spent 18 months or less % Spent 24 months or less % Spent 24-36 months % Spent more than 36 months	20.8 36.4 37.7 65.9 40.3 25.0	4 31.1 9 54.1 0 32.4 1 13.5	19.1 38.3 38.3 23.4	1 1 1 1				27.7 51.1 27.7 21.3	26.4 45.8 40.3 13.9	
	7	X AO as highest job held X Br/Im Chief as highest job held	73.6 45.26.3 54.	- 2	1 1	73.8 26.2	69.0 31.0	57.1 42.8	47.6 52.4	63.8 36.2	58.3 41.7	75.0
	15	M Departed for 05/06 comd M Departed for CGSC/SSC M Peparted for DA/Sec/OSD/OJCS M Retired/resigned M Other	39.5 14. 3.9 32. 17.1 14. 3.9 9. 35.5 30.	0 30.6 6 11.1 0 22.2 3 1.4 2 34.7	29.8 19.1 6.4 12.8 31.9		33.3 21.1 15.8 5.3 24.6	35.7 11.9 19.0 4.8 28.6	10.0 10.0 10.0 70.0	42.6 12.8 10.6 4.3 29.8	22.2 15.3 19.4 36.1	
!		Sise of subgroup	110 54	105	58	43	58	42	21	47	72	45

TABLE 2

CONSOLIDATION OF MEANS BY SUBGROUP

			SECT	ION	REPOR	TED AS	CON:	ROL B	RANCH
0#	QUESTION	ALL	PAB	NON PAF	CPT MAJ	MAJ(P) COL	CA	CS	CSS
9 10 11 12	Highest level comd CGSC completed SSC completed Time in PPBES billet Rank on departure Highest job held	1.356 3.872 4.762	1.295 3.568 4.537	1.441 4.290 5.072	1.000 4.141 4.028	4.161 2.634 1.624 3.667 5.323 1.696	1.456 4.025 5.063	1.229 4.000 4.486	1.286 3.540 4.480
16 17 18 19	Army needs: DA Some MACOM None	4.116 4.598	3.905 4.537	4.406	4.380 4.732	3.548 3.914 4.495 5.054	4.253 4.772	3.886 4.543	4.060
20 21 22 23	Ind needs: DA Some MACOM None	3.360	3.232 3.663	3.536 3.913	3.563 3.972	3.075 3.204 3.613 4.086	3.570 4.025	3.209 3.600	3.260 3.480
24 25 26 27	Both: DA Some MACOM None	3.646 3.841 4.244 4.512	3.684 4.147	4.058	4.009 4.521	3.462 3.645 4.032 4.312	3.949 4.316	3.714 4.286	3.760 4.100
29	05 Comd - Prim Sel 05 Comd - Alt Act 06 Comd - Prim Sel 06 Comd - Alt Act	2.049 2.207 2.024 2.189	2.337	2.029	2.324	1.989 2.118 1.968 2.086	2.152 1.987	2.600	2.020
33 34	CGSC Selection SSC - Primary Sel SSC - Alt Act SSC - Deferred Act	2.884 2.646 2.744 2.909	2.789	2.449	2.676 2.873	2.903 2.624 2.645 2.892	2.696 2.709	2.657 3.086	2,560 2.560
37	DA Staff/Secretariat OSD OJCS	3.354	3.379	3.319	3.155	3.505	3.354	3.314	3.480 3.380 3.500
40	Pers turnover is high Off are best & brightest Tasks often frustrating	3.799 3.810 4.195	3.904	3.681	3.803	3.774 3.815 4.183	3.795	3.886	3.820 3.780 4.200
43	Skills must be OJT Not in job long enough PPBES activities well org	2.957	2.726	3.275	3.056	3.656 2.882 2.699	3.013	2.857	2.940
46	Turnover made work diff Rewarding experience Can make contribution	3.854	4.189	3.391	4.169	3.032 3.613 3.935	3.722	4.171	3.840
	Size of subgroup	164	95	69	71	93	79	35	50

TABLE 2

CONSOLIDATION OF MEANS BY SUBGROUP

	·	OTHER	SPECIA	LTY	COMD 1	EXP	HIGHES!	r JOB
Q#	QUESTION	45	49	OTHER	01-04	05	AO	BR/TM CHIEF
9 10 11 12	Highest level comd CGSC completed SSC completed Time in PPEES billet Rank on departure Highest job held	2.294 1.485 3.853 3.941	2.536 1.196 3.696 4.821	1.419 4.014 5.095	2.436	2.056 3.630 5.852	2.476 1.163 3.514 4.371	1.690
16 17 18 19	Army needs: DA Some MACOM None	4.265 4.588	3.857 4.375	4.243	4.127	4.093	3.638 3.943 4.419 4.924	4.414 4.914
20 21 22 23	Ind needs: DA Some MACOM None	3.500 3.882	2.875 3.304	3.662 4.068	3.355	3.370 3.778	3.114 3.257 3.638 3.981	3.517 3.983
24 25 26 27	Both: DA Some MACOM None	4.441	3.821	4.473	4.273	4.185	3.495 3.667 4.105 4.362	4.483
29	05 Comd - Prim Sel 05 Comd - Alt Act 06 Comd - Prim Sel 06 Comd - Alt Act	2.412 2.353	2.196 1.857	2.122	2.291	2.037	1.990 2.162 1.971 2.133	2.259
33 34	CGSC Selection SSC - Primary Sel SSC - Alt Act SSC - Deferred Act	2.765 2.853	2.554 2.821	2.662 2.635		2.389	2.724 2.486 2.657 2.829	2.897 2.862
37	DA Staff/Secretariat OSD OJCS	3.412	3.250	3.405	3.273	3.519	3.486 3.390 3.562	3.259
40	Pers turnover is high Off are best & brightest Tasks often frustrating	3.706 4.324	4.036 4.268	3.689 4.081	3.782 4.155	3.868 4.278	3.657 3.781 4.190	3.895 3.895
43	Skills must be OJT Not in job long enough PPBES activities well ong	3.206	2.768	2.986		2.963	2.781	3.810 3.259 2.828
46	Turnover made work diff Rewarding experience Can make contribution	3.706	4.054	3.770	4.055	3.444	2.905 3.981 4.105	3.655
	Size of subgroup	34	56	74	110	54	105	58

CONSOLIDATION OF MEANS BY SUBGROUP

		PERIOD IN PPEES JOB YEAR DEPARTED				TED		
Q#	QUESTION	STILL		>2 43	>3		80-82	STILL
9 10 11	SSC completed Time in PPBES billet Rank on departure	3.465 2.442 1.209	1.621 3.224 6.069	1.262 5.643 6.310	1.100 8.000 5.762	3.723 2.553 1.391 4.957 6.128 1.532	1.431 4.833 6.222	1.200
16 17 18 19	Army needs: DA Some MACOM None	3.860 4.372	4.138 4.655	4.167	4.476	3.894 4.213 4.830 5.213	4.181 4.583	3.911 4.378
20 21 22 23	Ind needs: DA Some MACOM None	3.372 3.837	3.190 3.569	3.524 4.000	3.476 3.714	3.319 3.553 3.936 4.149	3.194 3.597	3.422 3.867
24 25 26 27	Some	3.698 4.233	3.690 3.983	4.048	4.143	3.872 4.064 4.447 4.524	3.750 4.097	3.756 4.267
	O5 Comd - Prim Sel O5 Comd - Alt Act O6 Comd - Prim Sel O6 Comd - Alt Act	1.977 1.884	2.052	2.452 2.071	2.619 2.524	2.106 2.298 2.170 2.298	2.264	2.022
32 33 34 35	SSC - Primary Sel SSC - Alt Act	2.395	2.672 2.690	2.833	3.429 3.333	2.787	2.694 2.861	2.422 2.467
37	DA Staff/Secretariat OSD OJCS	3.163	3.293	3.714	3.190	3.660 3.660 3.915	3.278	3.156
39 40 41	Pers turnover is high Off are best & brightest Tasks often frustrating	3.628	3.862		3.714	3.723 3.848 4.085		3.600
43	Skills must be OJT Not in job long enough PPBES activities well org	2.837	2.966	3.000	3.095	3.915 3.043 2.830	2.931	2.911
46	Turnover made work diff Rewarding experience Can make contribution	3.791	3.810	3.286 3.976 4.000	3.857	3.064 4.170 4.234	3.708	3.022 3.756 3.889
	Size of subgroup	43	58	42	21	47	72	45

Of the 72 who departed from 1986-82, 45.8% went in two years or less; 22.2% of the 72 went to command, and 36.1% of the 72 went to other assignments. The sharp decline in percentage of those departing for command is probably a direct result of the extended command tour lengths which began in late 1979/early 1986. Correspondingly, there was an increase in those officers who remained from two to three years, i.e., from 27.7% for the 1976-79 sub-group to 48.3% for the 1986-82 sub-group.

Optimal Tour Lengths

One of the principle issues of this paper was to determine how long the average action officer should remain in a DA staff PFBES programmer's billet. To develop meaningful data, it was necessary to consider the PFBES experience level of officers as well as how the Army's needs may vary with the individual's needs and those of his family as they impact on tour length. To include these factors, the questions were formulated as shown in Figure 1.

Review of the means of the responses by the various subgroups yielded the data shown in Table 3.

Translating the mean values of Table 3 into recommended tour lengths expressed in months was done using the Means to Month Conversion Table at Appendix 5. The conversion resulted in the data shown in Table 4. As expected, these data reflect the respondent's opinions that officers with no experience in PPBES should be assigned for a longer time than those who have worked with the system.

Note also that replies varied whether the respondent was assessing the needs of the Army or the needs of the individual. Again, as expected, the responses indicated a longer tour length when only the Army's needs were considered as opposed to individual and family needs.

QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT TO DETERMINE OFTIMAL TOUR LENGTH

Personal Opinions

Please answer questions 24 thru 46 to provide your personal opinions on how long you feel officers should be assigned to the <u>DA staff</u> in a billet associated with PPBES programming functions.

Answer questions for the PPBES office to which you were most recently assigned.

Base your answers on your experience during the time period in which you served in the PPBES office.

For questions 24 thru 35 use the following response codes:

- (1) 12 months or fewer
- (5) 31 to 36 months
- (2) 13 to 18 months
- (6) 37 to 42 months
- (3) 19 to 24 months
- (7) 43 to 48 months
- (4) 25 to 30 months
- (8) more than 48 months

Considering only the needs of the Army (learning curve, length and complexity of PPBES cycle, pay-back, getting "money's worth," etc), what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:

- 24. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 25. HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 26. HAD WORKED WITH PPBFS AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY?
- 27. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACOM LEVEL?

Considering only the needs of the individual (family, personal stress, "burn-out," etc) what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:

- 28. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 29. HAD SOME FXPERIFNCE WITH PPBFS ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 30. HAD WORKED WITH PPBES AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY?
- 31. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACON LEVEL? Considering the needs of both the Army and the individual, what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:
- 32. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 33. HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 34. HAD WORKED WITH PPBES AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY?
- 35. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACOM LEVEL?

STEGROUP MEANS FOR OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTES

	MIN	MEAN	MYZ
APPLY NEEDS ONLY			
DA PPBES experience	3.512	3 .789	4.586
Same DA experience	3.857	4.116	4.476
MACOM experience	4.369	4.598	4.836
No experience	4.778	5.116	5.466
INDIVIDUAL NEEDS ONLY			
DA PPBES experience	2.821	3.226	3.486
Same DA experience	2.875	3.360	3.662
MACOM experience	3.304	3.768	4.968
No experience	3.857	4.146	4.431
BOTH ARMY & INDIVIDUAL NEE	DS .		
DA PPBES experience	3.232	3.646	4.999
Some DA experience	3.411	3.841	4.147
MACOM experience	3.821	4.244	4.521
No experience	4.267	4.512	4.776
IN EXPERTEINE	7.49/	4.712	4,,,,

TABLE 3

RECOMMENDED OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTHS (MONTHS)

	MIN	MEAN	MAX
ARMY NEEDS ONLY			
DA PPBES experience	25	26	28
Some DA experience	27	28	30
MACOM experience	30	31	32
No experience	32	34	36
INDIVIDUAL NEEDS ONLY			
DA PPBES experience	28	23	24
Some DA experience	21	24	25
MACOM experience	23	26	28
No experience	27	28	30
BOTH ARMY & INDIVIDUAL NEED	6		
DA PPBES experience	23	25	28
Same DA experience	24	27	28
MACOM experience	26	29	31
No experience	29	31	32

TABLE 4

The differences varied from 3-6 months depending on the officer's emperience with PPRES. Overall, considering the needs of both the Army and the individual, the respondents recommended an optimal tour length of 25-31 months, again based on experience. This recommendation is consistent with the written comments received with the answer sheets. It is interesting to note with regard to this recommendation that 52% of the respondents were in fact assigned for two years or more and 45% were assigned for more than 2.5 years.

Stability in PPRES vs. Reassignment

Another major purpose of the study effort was to determine whether or not PPBES programmers on the DA staff should be permitted to leave their billets for reassignment prior to completion of the "optimal" tour lengths discussed above. Questionnaire respondents were asked to give their opinions on this relative to several different types of assignments as shown in Figure 2.

Again, using the means of the various subgroupings of respondents, their opinions are reflected in Table 5. Conversion of these data into statements of agreement or disagreement provides the information in Table 6. Thus, it is clear that the respondents believe that 05 and 06 command should take priority over completion of the "optimal" PPRES tour length. Opinions concerning OGSC and SSC level schooling and DA Staff/Army Secretariat/OSD level assignments are generally neutral, while there is some indication that completion of PPRES tours should take priority over assignment to OJCS.

Another comparison may be obtained by noting the absolute frequencies in which the 164 respondents checked the "strongly disagree" or "strongly agree" block (see Table 7).

QUESTICHMAIRE FORMAT TO DETERMINE ASSIGNMENT PRICRITY

In questions 32 thru 35 above, you selected optimum tour lengths for an average action officer assigned to your PPBFS office based on the needs of both the Army and the individual. Should completion of that tour length take priority over reassignment?

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement as it applies to each of the following types of reassignment.

STATEMENT: COMPLETION OF THE OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTH FOR MY PPBES OFFICE SHOULD TAKE PRIORITY OVER ASSIGNMENT FOR:

		trongly lisagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly -disagree
36.		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37.	05 level command alt activation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
38.	O6 level command primary selection	(1) an	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39.	06 level command alt activation	(1)	(5)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40	Staff college leve schooling	1 (1)	(5)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41.	SSC level schooling		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
42.	SSC level achooling	ng (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
43.	SSC level schoolin		(5)	(3)	(4)	(5)
44.	DA staff/secretari	at (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
45.	OSD staff	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46.	ojcs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

FIGURE 2

SUPCROUP MEANS FOR ASSIGNMENT PRIORITIES

COMPLETION OF PFBES OPTIMAL TOUR SHOULD TAKE PRIORITY OWER:	MIN	HEAT	MAX
05 Command - Primary Sel	1.852	2.549	2.476
05 Command - Alternate Act	1.977	2.257	2.619
06 Command - Primary Sel	1.741	2.024	2.524
06 Command - Alternate Act	1.884	2.189	2.543
OGSC Sel	2.688	2.884	3.381
SSC - Primary Sel	2.389	2.646	3.429
SSC - Alternate Act	2.442	2.744	3.333
SSC - Deferred Act	2.648	2.909	3.289
DA Staff/Army Secretariat	3.286	3.463	3.786
OSD	3.155	3.354	3.714
ajas	3.324	3.350	3,915

TABLE 5

RECOMMEND PRIORITY OF ASSIGNMENT

COMPLETION OF PPBES OPTIMAL TOUR SHOULD TAKE PRIORITY OVER:	MIN	MEAN	MAX
05 Command - Primary Sel	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
05 Command - Alternate Act		Disagree	
06 Command - Primary Sel	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral
06 Command - Alternate Act	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral
CGSC Sel	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SSC - Primary Sel	Disagree	Neutral	Neutral
SSC - Alternate Act	Disagree	Neutral	Neutral
SSC - Deferred Act	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
DA Staff/Army Secretariat	Neutral	Neutral	Agree
OSD	Neutral	Neutral	Agree
OJCS	Neutral	Agree	Agree

TABLE 6

ASSIGNMENT PRIORITY - COMPARISON OF MOTHER RESPONSES

COMPLETION OF PERES OPTIMAL TOUR SHOULD TAKE PRIORITY OVER:	STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY
O5 Command - Primary Sel	86	16
05 Command - Alternate Act	71	11
Of Command - Primary Sel	88	13
06 Command - Alternate Act	76	14
OGSC Sel	39	17
SSC - Primary Sel	47	16
SSC - Alternate Act	42	18
SSC - Deferred Act	48	23
DA Staff/Secretariat	13	34
OSD	14	31
OJCS	14	37

TABLE 7

Other Subjective Opinions of Respondents

The questionnaire contained nine statements regarding PPBES assignments and asked the respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each one. Statements are shown in Figure 3; their sequence has been reordered from that of the questionnaire to facilitate review. Means of the subgroups are shown in Figure 8, and conversion to statements of agreement or disagreement is shown in Figure 9.

Review of the means of the various sub-groups indicates that there was no collective "strong disagreement" or "strong agreement" with any statement. Indeed, only one sub-group, non-PAE officers, registered collective "disagreement"; this involved the statement that ". . . PPBES activities are well organized." All other statements evoked a "neutral" response or "agreement."

QUESTICAMAIRE FOSMAT FOR SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS

For items 47 thru 55 please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements based on your experience in your PPBES office:

-		rongly sagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
48.	Officers given PPBES assignments are among the "best and brightest" memb of the officers corps		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50.	Most of the skills that a PPBES programmer needs must be learned on the jo	(1) b	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47.	The personnel turn-over in PPBES programmers is high	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51.	Most officers do not stay in PPBES positions long enough to become effective at their job		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
53•	While serving my PPBES assignment, the turnover among my coworkers made productivity difficult	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49.	The actual tasks done by officers during a PPBFS ament are often frustrating	ssign-	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
52.	Based upon my experience in a PPBES assignment, I believe that PPBES activi are well organized		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
54.	Working in a PPBFS pro- gramming billet on the DA staff is a rewarding experience	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
55.	PPBES programmers on the DA staff are able to make meaningful contributions to the DA programming pro	·	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

FIGURE 3

SUBGROUP MEANS FOR SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS

STATISTICAL	MIN	MEAN	MAX
PPBES officers are "Best & Brightest"	3.600	3.810	4.036
PPBES skills must be developed by OJT	3.488	3.768	4.999
Turnover is high	3.355	3.799	4.934
Officers leave before they become effective	2.726	2.957	3.275
Turnover makes productivity difficult	2.862	3 .9 67	3.345
Tasks are frustrating	3.895	4.195	4.464
Activities well organized	2.464	2.774	3.000
Rewarding experience	3.391	3.854	4.189
Can make contribution	3.681	4.030	4.314

TABLE 8

SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS - AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT STATEMENTS

SILVENSIA	MIN	MEN	MAX
PPBES officers are "Best & Brightest"	Agree	Agree	Agree
PPBES skills must be developed by OJT	Neutral	Agree	Agree
Turnover is high	Neutral	Agree	Agree
Officers leave before they become effective	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Turnover makes productivity difficult	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Tasks are frustrating	Agree	Agree	Agree
Activities well organized	Disagree	Agree	Agree
Rewarding experience	Neutral	Agree	Agree
Can make contribution	Agree	Agree	Agree

TABLE 9

Additional observations are as follows:

- 1. Respondents agreed that officers assigned to PFBES billets are among the "best and brightest" members of the officer corps.
- 2. Respondents agreed that most skills must be learned on the job. Voluntary comments support this view.
- 3. Officers agreed that turnover of PPBES programmers was high, but they were neutral in their feelings as to whether officers did

not stay in their jobs long enough to become effective or if the turnover made productivity difficult.

4. Officers agreed that actual tasks are often frustrating, and they in turn disagreed with the statement that PPBES activities are well organized. On the contrary, they agreed that working in a PPBES programming billet is a rewarding experience and that they could make meaningful contributions to the DA programming process.

Voluntary Comments of Respondents

Eighty-three of the 164 respondents submitted voluntary comments which are synthesized at Appendix 2. The comments may be consolidated into five major groups:

- 1. Advantages of PPBES Programming Assignment
- 2. Disadvantages of PPBES Programming Assignment
- 3. Comments on PPBES Programmers Assignments Policy
- 4. Comments on Training for PPBES Programmers
- 5. Comments on Ouestionnaire

Comments citing advantages of a PPBES assignment must be viewed in conjunction with those listing disadvantages. It is evident that the latter outnumbered the former (each comment listed generally appeared only once). As described in the preceding paragraph, while officers believed that they could make contributions and found the experience rewarding, the frustrations of such an assignment are significant. Common threads among the stated disadvantages are dissatisfaction with the knowledge and decisionmaking ability of some "bosces," the apparent importance of "playing politics," and endless "what if" drills.

Comments concerning recommended tour lengths were consistent with questionnaire responses wherein two to three years was the general

consensus. Comments again mentioned frustrations of PPBES work and resultant "burnout." One comment pointed out that an O6 in the PPBES system can have far greater influence than a brigade commander and recommended an O6 tour length of four years. Other ideas suggested that PPBES programmers be made fully aware of frustrations, working hours, and impacts on the family; that psychological testing be a prerequisite; and that currently assigned action officers be given a vote on the acceptability of nominees for PPBES billets in their shop.

Suggestions for training officers for PPBES jobs supported questionnaire responses that OJT was the primary method. Several officers, however, commented that some form of read-ahead material would be helpful prior to reporting for assignment, that a formal orientation once on board would be of benefit; and that the Army school system (CGSC/SSC) could do a better job of institutional training in PPBES procedures. There were several comments which stressed the need for people to serve as action officers on the DA staff for 18-24 months before going into a programming billet.

Comments on the questionnaire itself were contradictory, as expected. Several officers felt the questionnaire was unambiguous while others believe it contained built-in bias. The role of civilians was intentionally omitted because uniformed personnel play the predominate role in programming while the role of civilians is stronger in many budgeting offices. Planning and budgeting were excluded due to the limited time available. Subsequent efforts should deal with these critical functions. The effects of the director of PAED, while not addressed directly, may be noted in the frequency listings grouped by year of departure. The omission of the ODCSOPS Program and Integration

Division and the error on the questionnaire for Questions 36-46 have been addressed in Chapters II and III respectively.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Reliability of the Findings

The responses to the questionnaire provide findings statistically significant at the O5 level and, indeed, may be considered to be on the conservative side.

Conclusions

- 1. Officers who took part in the study all had previous or current experience as DA staff PFBES programmers as defined in Chapter II. Accordingly, they may be characterized as a panel of knowledgeable, but not necessarily unbiased, experts on the question of optimal tour lengths for DA staff programmers.
- 2. The extension of command tour lengths has improved the overall stability of officers in DA staff PPBES programmer's billets.
- 3. The optimal tour length for a PPBES programmer on the DA staff, considering the needs of both the Army and the individual, is between 24 and 36 months. This conclusion assumes the officer will have spent 12-18 months on the DA staff as an action officer prior to becoming a PPBES programmer.
- 4. Assignment stability of DA PPBES programmers should take priority over all other assignments except command and primary selection for attendance at SSC.

- 5. Duty as a PPBES programmer, although rewarding in most cases, is a highly frustrating experience which requires a unique type of individual.
- 6. PPBES skills are best learned on the job due to complexity and dynamics of the system; however, formal orientations and reading materials prior to or at the beginning of an assignment and improved instruction in service schools would contribute to improved performance early in an assignment.
- 7. Many O6-O8 level bosses do not understand the PPBES process and do not provide adequate leadership or demonstrate a positive decisionmaking capability.
- 8. The officers previously and presently assigned to PPBES programmers' billets are generally a sincere, highly motivated, and dedicated group who earnestly seek the best for the Army.
- 9. Follow-on study of the planning and budgeting assignment policy is appropriate.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That officers selected for duty as PFBES programmers have 12-18 months experience as DA stalf action officers.
- 2. That officers selected for duty as PPBES programmers be stabilized for 24 to 30 months in the PPBES office, exceptions only for 05 or 06 command or primary SSC selection.
- 3. That assignment as a PPBES programmer be voluntary and that officers nominated be carefully screened and personally interviewed by prospective raters to judge the officer's ability to handle the pressures and frustrations of such an assignment.
- 4. That a formal orientation program be established by the DA staff to bring newly assigned programmers to a minimum essential knowledge level. That the "Programmers Guide" be furnished officers prior to their assignment to a PPBES billet.
- 5. That PPBES instruction in service schools be expanded, principally thru the elective program.
- 6. That senior officers assigned as PPBES division chiefs and directors have prior experience as action officers in the PPBES.
- 7. That follow-on studies be conducted on the assignment policies of PPBES planners and budgeteers.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY US ARMY WAR COLLEGE CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA

ASPLY 10

12 MAR 1982

SUBJECT: USAWC Military Studies Program Questionnaire

SEE DISTRIBUTION

- 1. One of our students is participating in our Military Studies Program to determine the optimal length of assignment of PPBES programmers on the DA staff. The ultimate goal is to improve the ability of the Army to develop more coherent, balanced, and defensible resource allocations through the PPBES process.
- The basis for this study will be the response to questionnaires by officers previously or presently assigned to the DA staff in billets closely associated with PPBES programming functions. As one of those officers, your experience and opinions are critical to the success of this effort. Accordingly, we would appreciate your assistance by completing and returning the inclosed questionnaire. A maximum of 30 minutes will be required. The study/questionnaire has been approved by HQDA UP AR 600-46.
- 3. All response data from individuals will be confidential; individual answer sheets will be destroyed by the project officer when the analysis is complete but NLT 31 May 1982.
- 4. Please return the completed questionnaire and answer sheet at your earliest convenience but NLT 7 April 1982 in order for this project to meet its milestones. A self-addressed envelope has been provided for your use.
- 5. Project officer is LTC(P) Paul T. Weyrauch, AV 242-4005.

FOR THE COMMANDANT:

Incl ΩS

LIAM T. LEGGET

Colonel, Infantry

Secretary/Chief of Staff

DISTRIBUTION:

Officers assigned to DA staff in PPBES programming billets during the period 1977-present.

SCR: ATZI-NCR-MA-82-10

1 :

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

on

Optimal Length of Assignment of PPBFS Programmers on the DA Staff

for

Military Studies Program
US Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013

Answers to questions 1 thru 55 should be recorded on the attached mark sense answer sheet with a #2 pencil. If you change any answer, please erase the incorrect answer completely.

PART 1

Factual Information

Please answer questions 1 thru 23 to provide personal data concerning your experience on the <u>DA Staff</u> in a billet associated with PPBES <u>programming</u> functions.

If you have been assigned to more than one of the offices listed, answer questions based on your most recent assignment.

If you held more than one job within one of the offices listed during a single tour, answer questions based on your total time within that office.

1-2 WHAT IS YOUR BASIC YEAR GROUP (LAST TWO DIGITS)?

Use column 1 & 2 on the answer sheet to record your response. For example, if your basic year group is "1960," enter "6" in col 1 and "0" in col 2.

- 2 3. TO WHICH OFFICE ARE/WERE YOU ASSIGNED DURING YOUR MOST RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES PROGRAMMING FUNCTIONS?
 - (1) Program Development Team/Division. PAED
 - (2) Manpower and Force Program Analysis Team/Division, PAED
 - (3) Acquisition Support Program Analysis Team/Division, PAED
 - (4) Resource Management Review Division, PAED
 - (5) Information Resources Management Division, PAED
 - (6) Program & Management Office, ODCSPER
 - (7) Program & Budget Office, ODCSOPS
 - (8) Program & Budget Division, ODCSLOG
 - (9) Program Coordination Team, ODCSRDA
- 3 4-5 WHAT YEAR DID YOU REPORT FOR DUTY IN THE PPBES OFFICE (LAST TWO DIGITS OF CALENDAR YEAR)?
- 4 6. WHAT WAS YOUR RANK AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPBFS OFFICE?
 - (1) CPT

(5) LTC

(2) CPT (P)

(6) LTC (P)

(3) MAJ

(7) COL

(4) MAJ (P)

- (8) COL (P)
- 7-8. WHAT WAS YOUR ASSIGNMENT CONTROL BRANCH AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPBES OFFICE?

	e indicate each branch			sheet usin	g two d	igit response	code
(01)	IN	(05)	EN	(09)	OD	(13)	AVN
(02)	AR	(06)	SC	(10)	QM	(14)	SJA
(03)	FA	(07)	MP	(11)	TC	(15)	FI
(04)	AD	(80)	MI	(12)	MSC	(16)	AG

- 6 9-10. WHAT WAS YOUR PRIMARY SPECIALTY (TWO DIGIT NUMERICAL DESIGNATION) AT .
 THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPRES OFFICE?
- 7 11-12. WHAT WAS YOUR OTHER SPECIALTY (TWO DIGIT NUMERICAL DESIGNATION) AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPBES OFFICE?
- 8 13. WHAT WAS YOUR HIGHEST LEVEL OF COMMAND EXPERIENCE AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPRES OFFICE?
 - (1) None at any grade
 - (2) 01/02 level command (plt/sec)
 - (3) 03 level command (co/btry/trp/avn plt/det)
 - (4) 04 level command (avn co/air cav trp/ADP det/msl btry)
 - (5) 05 level command (bn/sqdn/proj mgr/plant)
 - (6) 06 level command (bde/div arty/gp/district/proj mgr/DISCOM)
- 9 14. WHAT STAFF COLLEGE LEVEL SCHOOLING HAD YOU COMPLETED AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPBES OFFICE?
 - (1) No staff college level schooling completed
 - (2) CGSC resident
 - (3) CGSC non-resident
 - (4) Armed Forces Staff College
 - (5) Other US service staff college (Air/Navy)
 - (6) Other equivilent schooling (incl foreign)
- 15. WHAT SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE LEVEL SCHOOLING HAD YOU COMPLETED AT THE TIME YOU REPORTED FOR DUTY IN THE PPBES OFFICE?
 - (1) No senior service college level completed
 - (2) Army War College resident
 - (3) Army War College Corresponding Studies Program
 - (4) Air War College
 - (5) Naval War College
 - (6) National War College
 - (7) Industrial College of the Armed Forces
 - (8) Other equivilent schooling (incl foreign)

For questions 16-20:

If you are still assigned to one of the offices listed, but have orders with a definite departure date, answer the questionnaire as of the departure date. If you are still assigned and do not have orders or have orders without a definite departure date, answer questions as "still assigned".

- 16. WHAT PERIOD OF TIME DID YOU SERVE IN THE PPBES OFFICE?
 - (1) N/A still assigned
- (6) 31 to 36 months
- (2) 12 months or fewer
- (7) 37 to 42 months

(3) 13 to 18 months

- (8) 43 to 48 months
- (4) 19 to 24 months
- (9) more than 48 months

- (5) 25 to 30 months
- 17-18. WHAT WAS YOUR RANK AT THE TIME YOU LEFT THE PPBES OFFICE?

Please indicate response on answer sheet using two digit response code for each rank shown below:

- (01) N/A still assigned
- (06) LTC

(02) CPT

(07) LTC (P)

(03) CPT (P)

(08) COL

(04) MAJ

(09) COL (P)

(05) MAJ (P)

- (10) BG
- 13 19-20. IN WHAT YFAR DID YOU LEAVE THE PPBFS OFFICE (LAST TWO DIGITS OF CALENDAR YEAR)?

If still assigned, fill in columns to indicate "99"

- 14 21. WHAT WAS/IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL JOB YOU HELD/HOLD IN THE PPBES OFFICE?
 - (1) Action officer
 - (2) Branch/team chief (05 level)
 - (3) Team/division/office chief (06 level)

15 22-23. WHY DID YOU LEAVE THE PPBES OFFICE?

Include TDY enroute as part of the ultimate assignment, e.g., if you departed to attend the pre-command course enroute to battalion level command, you should mark "06" or "07" on the answer sheet as applicable.

Please indicate response on the answer sheet using two digit response code for each assignment shown below:

- (01) N/A still assigned
- (02) To attend staff college level schooling
- (03) To attend SSC level schooling primary list
- (04) To attend SSC level schooling activated from alt list
- (05) To attend SSC level schooling activated from deferred list
- (06) To assume 05 level command primary list
- (07) To assume 05 level command activated from alt list
- (08) To assume 06 level command primary list
- (09) To assume 06 level command activated from alt list
- (10) Assigned to DA staff/Army secretariat
- (11) Assigned to OSD staff
- (12) Assigned to OJCS
- (13) To retire
- (14) To resign or be released from active duty
- (15) Other____

Please mark "15" on answer sheet, and write in duty on questionnaire, e.g.,
"Division G3"

PART II

Personal Opinions

Please answer questions 24 thru 46 to provide your personal opinions on how long you feel officers should be assigned to the DA staff in a billet associated with PPBES programming functions.

Answer questions for the PPBES office to which you were most recently assigned.

Base your answers on your experience during the time period in which you served in the PPBES office.

For questions 24 thru 35 use the following response codes:

- (1) 12 months or fewer
- (5) 31 to 36 months
- (2) 13 to 18 months
- (6) 37 to 42 months

- (3) 19 to 24 months
- (7) 43 to 48 months

(4) 25 to 30 months

(8) more than 48 months

Considering only the needs of the Army (learning curve, length and complexity of PPBES cycle, pay-back, getting "money's worth," etc), what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:

- 16 24. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 17 25. HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 18 26. HAD WORKED WITH PPBFS AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY?
- 19 27. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACOM LEVEL?

Considering only the needs of the individual (family, personal stress, "burn-out," etc) what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:

- 20 28. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 29. HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH PPBFS ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 22 30. HAD WORKED WITH PPBES AT MACON LEVEL ONLY?
- 23 31. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACOM LEVEL?

Considering the needs of both the Army and the individual, what do you think should be the optimum tour length for the average action officer assigned to your office if the officer:

- 24 32. HAD WORKED IN A DESIGNATED PPBES PROGRAMMING BILLET ON THE DA STAFF?
- 25 33. HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES ON THE DA STAFF, E.G., HAD WORKED WITH PBG/PARR/POM INPUT/ISSUES?
- 26 34. HAD WORKED WITH PPBES AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY?
- 27 35. HAD NO EXPERIENCE WITH PPBES AT DA OR MACOM LEVEL?

in questions 32 thru 35 above, you selected optimum tour lengths for an average action officer assigned to your PPBES office based on the needs of both the Army and the individual. Should completion of that tour length take priority over reassignment?

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement as it applies to each of the following types of reassignment.

STATEMENT: COMPLETION OF THE OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTH FOR MY PPBES OFFICE SHOULD TAKE PRIORITY OVER ASSIGNMENT FOR:

			rongly sagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly
28	36.	05 level command primary selection	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29	37.	05 level command alt activation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30	38.	06 level command primary selection	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
31	39.	06 level command alt activation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
32	40	Staff college level schooling	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33	41.	SSC level schooling primary selection	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
34	42.	SSC level schooling alt activation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
35	43.	SSC level schooling deferred activation		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
36	44.	DA staff/secretaria	t (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37	45.	OSD staff	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
38	46.	ojcs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

For items 47 thru 55 please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements based on your experience in your PPBES office:

			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
39	47.	The personnel turn-over in PPBES programmers is high		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40	48.	Officers given PPBES assignments are among t "best and brightest" me of the officers corps		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41	49.	The actual tasks done be officers during a PPBES ment are often frustrat	assign-	(5)	(3)	(4)	(5)
42	50.	Most of the skills that a PPBES programmer need must be learned on the	S	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
43	51.	Most officers do not st in PPBES positions long enough to become effect at their job		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
44	52.	Based upon my experienc in a PPBES assignment, believe that PPBES acti are well organized	I	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
45	53.	While serving my PPBES assignment, the turnove amoung my coworkers mad productivity difficult		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46	54.	Working in a PPBFS pro- gramming billet on the DA staff is a rewarding experience		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47	55.	PPBES programmers on th DA staff are able to ma meaningful contribution to the DA programming p	ke s	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)


PART III

Additional Information

Please use the space below to make any additional comments concerning this study, your experiences, or the validity of the questionnaire.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!!!

Please return the questionnaire and the answer sheet in the envelope provided.



9		z			•		-	,		
59					-	-				
58										
57			-							
26										
55					_					
24		,				-	_			
53										
52							-			
51										
20		-								
				_						
48										
47			_							
46										
45										
44								-		
43									_	
42			_							
-		٠.	•					-		-
40										
39		,			æ	-	-			
38							`			 -
37							-			
36			_		i.					
35		•		ų.		-	-			
34		-	-	<u>.</u>			-		-	
33	-	ţ.	,.	4	,.	*	,	,	-	
32	•	e	٠,			-	-	٠.	•	ŧ
31	•	L.		·	u .	ų	-	~	-	:

SCR: ATZI-NCR-MA-82-10

Optimal Length of Assignment of PPBES Programmers on the DA Staff

LTC Weyrauch, '82

APPENDIX 2

NARRATIVE COMMENTS

A. COMMENTS ON ADVANTAGES OF PPBES PROGRAMMING ASSIGNMENT ON THE DA STAFF

Working with good people
Able to prevent dumb things from happening
Learned about management of Army systems
Learned large scale, macroanalysis
"Lived the process"
Able to be innovative
Given "carte blanche"
Backed 100% by boss
Great general officer bosses
Fun & rewarding
Ability to influence outweighs frustration
Contributed
PPBES is fundamentally sound

Best job in Army next to comd Great experience Learned a lot

B. COMMENTS ON DISADVANTAGES OF PPBES PROGRAMMING ASSIGNMENT ON THE DA STAFF

Turmoil in Pentagon Worst experience of mil career Never want to go back Glad to be "rescued" by comd list Entire system in disarray Confusion Busy work/"what if" drills/make work Couldn't keep fires from starting Boss didn't know what was going on Many frustrations Suboptimization by all elements Bosses couldn't make hard decisions Pamily suffered Do & redo - format, not content Work long & hard to develop program - blown away in 28 min by group of guys who don't understand issues

Like a sandstorm - no matter how much experience you have, you never know where you are

Great effort, little results

Program is not constructed in best interest of Mation, DOD, Congress

Pet rocks/ gold watches frustrate system

Politics play as you get higher in system Golden rule - "He who has the gold rules"

Very political - well connected GO get their PDIP's funded

Modernisation is out of control

Programming is haphazard

Undisciplined growth in PFBES & ADP

System is more convoluted, redundant, crowded, and out of control than ever

Transition from P to P to B not smooth, can't audit

Need well defined management structure

Leadership tries to change system each year, results in much work but the same product

Annual changes to system due to: Whim of seniors, lack of discipline, instability

Lack of quality people in PAE/COA

Analytical software lousy

Very little analysis performed by PAE/Consolidate FOM & stack PDIP's

Functional FOC on ARSTAFF not trained

Quality officers in programming billets, but not all "best & brightest"
Poor management of process by PAED & ODSCOPS

C. COMMENTS ON PPBES PROGRAMMERS ASSIGNMENTS POLICY

No special case for programmers - all DA staff equal in ability Send to SSC before PPBES job Bright people for short tours Make PPBES a specialty after CGSC Job is too broad for one specialty On board guys chop on new guy's nomination

3 years max (frustration level)
Tour length never less than 2 years (except - medical/incomp)
2-3 years (handle other priority assignments on a case-by-case basis)
ASPAD 18-24 months - burnout after
2 cycles optimum
At least two years
2 years about all you can take - burnout affects quality of work

One year in PAE is enough

The hope of getting out before 3+ years keeps people going - may have a problem if stabilized tours for four years - no hope Subsequent assignment to key MACOM staffs

Need to look also at DASC/FISO turnover

Stabilize - handle like command
Command takes priority over everything
Stabilize decisionmakers
Stability of bosses important
86 positions key - far greater influence than bde cdr. - 4 yrs
Must complete tours
Stability important in working with Congressional staffers
Give psychological testing: no-go for sensitive - need quality; big ego
Key tour length to personality to some degree
Advise potential AO of price to be paid-frustrations, working hours,
impact on family
Tour length won't help; system is out of control

D. COMMENTS ON TRAINING FOR PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF

Get MACOM's out of process; kill PARR COA should run PPBES Combine programming & budgeting

Procedures change every cycle

Can learn job in 6 months

Need prep school & one cycle experience

Need prep course or correspondence course

Need one cycle to learn system

Need training ahead of time

Need educational package or course combined w/OJT

CJT is only way; schooling little or no help

Need institutional education

Can learn some skills ahead of time; some only by CJT

Tie electives at CGSC/SSC to next assignment - esp PPBRS

Experience at MACOMs little or no help

Budget people must learn programming process

Need functional specialists (procurement, R&D, arm, maint) in prog billets rather than 49

18-24 months on DA staff before PAE (any prog job)

E. COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

Good survey Good questions Well designed questionnaire - unambiguous responses

Questions too broad — incorrect inferences Biased structure of questions precludes intellectual integrity Did not address role of civilians Does not address modus operandi of Dir PAE Talks only to programmers — not planners or budgeteers Valid for determining optimal tour length - however, "burnout" seldom cause for turnover

Omitted P & I Div, SSP, %A Error in heading for Q36-46

APPENDIX 3

FREQUENCY LISTING OF RESPONSES

D5-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 08-13-82

GO1 BASIC YEAR GROUP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
	52	1	0.6	0.6	0.6
	53	1	0.6	0.6	1.2
	55	1	0.5	0.6	1.8
	56	4	2.4	2.5	4.3
	57	1	0.6	0.6	4.9
	58	5	3.0	3.1	8.0
	59	9	5.5	5.5	13.5
	60	11	6.7	6.7	20.2
	61	15	9.1	9.2	29.4
	62	32	19.5	19.6	49-1
	63	16	9.8	9.8	58.9
	64	18	11.0	11.0	69.9
	65	9	5.5	5.5	75.5
	66	14	8.5	8.6	84.0
	67	13	7.9	8.0	92.0
	68	6	3.7	3.7	95.7
	69	1	0.6	0.6	96.3
	70	3	1.8	1.8	96,2
	72	1	0.6	0.6	98.8
	73	1	0.6	0.6	99.4
	77	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
OUT OF RANGE		1	0.6	MISSING	100.0

OPTIMAL LENG	TH OF ASSI	ENMENT OF PPBE	S PROGRAMMER	IS ON DA STAFF	PAGE			
05-13-82	FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82							
		ڊ ي وڪيٽ						
	TO	TAL 164	100.0	100.0				
REAN	63+096	STD ERR	0.280	MEDIAN	62.594			
MODE	62.000	STD DEV	3.579	VARIANCE	12.809			
KURTOSIS	1.552	SKEYNËSS	0.225	range	25.000			
MINIMUM	52.000	MAXIMUM	77.000					
VALID CASES	163	MISSING CAS	ES 1					

OPTIBAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF

- -

05-13-62

•

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

802 MOST RECENT PPBES OFFICE ASSIGNED

CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
PD TEAM-DIV.	PAED	1	21	12.8	12.8	12.8
MFPA TEAM-DI	V. PAED	2	37	22.6	22.6	35.4
4SPA TEAM-DI	V. PAED	3	23	14.0	14.0	49.4
RMR DIV. PAF	D	4	io	6.1	6.1	55.5
IRM DIV. PAE	D	5	4	2.4	2.4	57.9
P&B DIV. CDC	SPER	6	13	7.9	7.9	65.9
P&B DFF ODCS	OPS	7	31	18.9	18.9	84.8
P&M DIV.ODCS	LOG	8	8	4.9	4.9	89.6
PC TEAM. DDC	SRDA	9	17	10.4	10.4	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4.488	s	TD ERR	0.213	MEDIAN	3.600
MODE	2.000	S	TD DEV	2.723	VARIANCE	7.417
KURTOSIS	-1,412	S	KEWNESS	0.279	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	M	MUMIXA	9.000		
VALID CASES	164	м	ISSING CASE	s o		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

QO3 YEAR REPORTED TO PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LAB	EL CO		BSOLUTE EQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
		73	1	0.6	0.6	0.6
		74	5	3.0	3.0	3.7
		75	17	10-4	10.4	14.0
		76	13	7.9	7.9	22.0
		77	21	12.8	12.8	34.8
		78	19	11.6	11.6	46.3
		79	35	21.3	21.3	67.7
		80	29	17+7	17.7	85.4
		81	21	12.8	12.8	98.2
		82	3	1.9	1.8	100.0
	† 01	AL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	78•274	STD	ERR	0 • 163	MEDIAN	78•671
MODE	79.000	STD		2.082	VARIANCE	4.335
KURTOSIS	-0,752	_	NESS	-0.405	RANGE	9,000
RINIMUM	73,000	MAXI		82.000		
VALID CASES	164	MÍSS	ING CASE	s o		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE 10

05-13-62

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

DOA RANK AT TIME REPORTED TO PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREG (PERCENT)
EPT		1	6	3.7	3.7	3.7
CPT HPM		2	1	0.6	0.6	4.3
MAJ		3	64	39.0	39.0	43.3
HQH LAM		4	18	11.0	11.0	54.3
LTC		5	62	37.8	37.8	92.1
LTC HPP		6	8	4.9	4.9	97.0
COL		7	5	3.0	3.0	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN RODE KURTOSIS MINIMUM	4.055 3.000 -0.166 1.000	S	TD ERR TD DEV KEWNESS IAXIMUM	0.099 1.264 -0.049 7.000	MEDIAN Variance Range	4 • 1 1 1 1 • 5 9 8 6 • 0 0 0
VALID CASES	164	N	ISSING CAS	ES 0		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE 11

25-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

005 ASSIGNMENT CONTROL BRANCH WHEN REPORTED

CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
IN		1	30	18.3	18.3	18.3
дR		2	i2	7.3	7.3	25.6
FA		3	30	18.3	18.3	43.9
άD		4	7	4 • 3	4+3	48.2
EN		5	23	14.0	14.0	62.2
sc		6	9	5.5	5.5	67.7
MI		8	3	1.8	1.8	69.5
OD .		9	is	9.1	9.1	78.7
ОМ		10	9	5.5	5.5	84.1
TC		11	10	6.1	6.1	90.2
MSC		12	1	0.6	0.6	90.9
AVN		13	2	1.2	1.2	92.1
FI		15	8	4.9	4.9	97.0
AG		រូស	2	1.2	1.2	98.2
CML		17	1	0.6	0.6	98,8
HG		18	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	•	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
HEAN	5.750		TD ERR	0.345	MEDIAN	4 • 630
HODE	1.000		TD DEV	4.420	VARIANCE	19.538
KURTOSIS	-0.047		KENNESS	0.918	RANGE	17.000
MINIMUM	1.000	M	MUMIXA	18.000		
VALID CASES	164	M	ISSING CASE	s o		

05-13-62 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q06 PRIMARY SPECIALTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FRED (PERCENT)
TN	11	29	17.7	17.7	17.7
AR	12	12	7.3	7.3	25.0
PA	13	24	14.6	14.6	39.6
ADA	14	5	3.0	3.0	42.7
AVN	15	4	2.4	2.4	45.1
ENGR	21	20	12.2	12.2	57.3
CBT STRAC C-E	25	9	5.5	5.5	62.8
TAC-STRAC INTEL	35	3	1.8	1.8	64.6
PERS MGT	41	1	0.6	0 • 6	65.2
PERS ADMIN	42	1	0.6	0.6	65.9
FIN	44	7	4.3	4.3	70.1
COMPT	45	4	2.4	2.4	72.6
ORSA	49	9	5.5	5.5	78.0
OPS-FD	54	2	1 • 2	1 • 2	79.3
NED	67	1	0.6	0.6	79.9
AVN MAT MGT	71	3	1.8	1.8	81.7
MSL MAT MGT	73	1	0.6	0.6	82.3
CMP	74	2	1.2	1.2	g3.5
HUN MAT MGT	75	1	0.6	0.6	84.1
RAINT MGT	91	11	6.7	6.7	90.9
MAT-SVC MGT	92	8	4.9	4.9	95.7
TRANS MGT	95	5	3.0	3.0	98.8

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF	ASSIGNMENT OF	PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF	PAGE	13
05-13-82	FILE - NONAME	- CREATED 05-13-82		

PROC		97 TOTAL	2 164	1.2	1.2	100.0
REAN RODE Kurtosis Rinimum	35.104 11.000 -0.428 11.000	ST.	DEV DEV EWNESS (IMUM	2.321 29.723 1.050 97.000	MEDIAN Variance Range	20•900 883•455 86•000
VALID CASES	164	MIS	SING CAS	ES 0		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

007 OTHER SPECIALTY

05-13-82

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
IN	11	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
FA	13	3	1.8	1.8	3.0
ZDA	14	1	0.6	0.6	3.7
AVN	15	2	1.2	1.2	4.9
PERS MGT	41	12	7.3	7.3	12.2
PERS ADMIN	42	1	0.6	0.6	12.8
COMPT	45	34	20.7	20.7	33.5
FAO	48	3	1.8	1.8	35.4
DRSA	49	56	34 • 1	34+1	69.5
7 & D	51	11	6.7	6.7	76.2
ATOM EN	52	1	0.6	0.6	76.R
ADP	53	4	2.4	2.4	79.3
OPS-FD	54	12	7.3	7.3	86.6
PETROL	81	2	1.2	1.2	87.8
MAINT MGT	91	2	1.2	1.2	89.0
MAT-SVC MGT	92	3	1.8	1.8	90.9
TRANS MGT	95	1	0.6	0.6	91.5
PROC	97	9	5.5	5.5	97.0
OTHER	99	5	3.0	3.0	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	

OPTIMAL LEN	GTH OF ASSIG	NMENT OF PPBE	S PROGRAMME	RS ON DA STAFF	PAGE	1,
05-13-82	FILE	- NONAME -	TREATED 05-	13-82		
MEAN Mode Kurtosis	52.518 49.000 1.948	STD ERR STD DEV SKEWNESS MAXIMUM	1.454 18.624 1.142 99.000	MEDIAN Variance Range	48,929 346,865 88,000	

MISSING CASES

VALID CASES

164

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

PAGE 16

008 HIGHEST LEVEL OF COMMAND EXPERIENCE

05-13-82

CATEGORY LAREL	CODE		RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NONE AT ANY GRADE	1	1	0.6	0.6	0.6
C1-02 LEVEL CMD	2	6	3.7	3.7	4.3
03 LEVEL CMD	3	90	54.9	54.9	59.1
04 LEVEL CMD	4	13	7.9	7• 9	67.1
C5 LEVEL CMD	5	54	32.9	32.9	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.68	\$	STD ERR	0.078	MEDIAN	3+333
NODE 3.00	0 5	STU DEV	0.994	VARIANCE	0.989
KURTOSIS -1.22	•	KEWNESS	0.280	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM 1.00		MUMIXAN	5.000		
VALID CASES 16	4 I	AISSING CASES	0		

DO9 STAFF COLLEGE LEVEL SCHOOLING COMPLETED

CATEGORY L	ABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREG (PERCENT)
NONE COMPL	ETED	1	10	6.1	6.1	6. i
CGSC RESID	ENT	2	110	67.1	67.1	73.2
EGSC NON-R	ESIDENT	3	8	4.9	4.9	78.0
AFS COLLEG	F	•	25	15.2	15.2	93.3
OTHER US S	,c	. 5	10	6.1	6.1	99.4
OTHER EQUI	VILENT	6	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.500	s	TD ERR	0 • 0 8 3	MEDIAN	2 • 1 5 5
MODE	2.000		TD DEV	1.060	VARIANCE	1.123
KURTOSIS	0.506		KENNESS	1.237	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	M	AXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASE	s 164	M	ISSING CASE	s 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

010 SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE LEVEL SCHOOLING

CATEGORY LAND	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	_	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NONE COMPLETE	ΕV	1	140	85.4	85.9	85.9
KWC RESIDENT		2	14	8.5	8.6	94.5
AWC CORR STU	SIES	3	1	0.6	0.6	95.1
RAVAL WAR COL	LEGE	5	1	0.6	0.6	95.7
NATIONAL WAR	COLLEGE	6	4	2.4	2.5	98.2
ICAF		7	3	1.8	1.8	100.0
OUT OF RANGE			1	0.6	MISSING	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	1 • 356	S	TU ERR	0.092	MEDIAN	1 • 0 82
MODE	1.000	S	TO DEV	1.169	VARIANCE	1.756
KURTOSIS	14 - 419	S	KEWNESS	3.875	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000		MUMIXA	7.000		
VALID CASES	163	N	ISSING CAS	SES 1		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PRES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF . PAGE 19
D5-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q11 PERIOD OF TIME SERVED IN PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE		RELATIVE PREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
RA - STILL ASSIGNED	1	.43	26.2	26.2	26.2
12 MONTHS OR LESS	2	13	7.9	7.9	34.1
13 TO 18 WONTHS	3	19	11.6	11.6	45.7
19 TO 24 MONTHS	4	26	15.9	15.9	61.6
25 TO 30 MONTHS	5	15	9.1	9.1	70.7
31 TQ 36 WONTHS	6	27	16.5	16.5	87.2
37 TO 42 WONTHS	. 7	5	3.0	3.0	90.2
43 TO 48 WONTHS	8	11	6.7	6.7	97.0
MORE THAN 48	9	5	3.0	3.0	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.872	S	TD ERR	0 • 186	MEDIAN	3.769
MODE 1.000	S	TD DEV	2.381	VARIANCE	5.671
KURTUSIS -0.917	S	KEWNESS	0.353	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM 1.000	M	MUMIXA	9.000		
VALID CASES 164	м	ISSING CASES	0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q12 RANK AT TIME LEFT PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LAR	FL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STILL ASSIGN	ED	1	45	27.4	27.4	27.4
CPT #P#		3	1	0.6	0.6	28.0
LAM		4	11	6.7	6.7	34.8
MAJ HPM		5	2	1.2	1.2	36.0
LTC		6	77	47.0	47.0	82.9
LTC HPM		7	9	5 • 5	5.5	88.4
COL		8	18	11.0	11•ò	99.4
BG		10	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN	4.762	s	TD ERR	0 • 1 9 6	MEDIAN	5•799
₽ODE	6.000	S	TD DEV	2.509	VARIANCE	6.293
KURTOSIS	-1.101	S	KENNESS	-0.553	RANGE	9.000
MINIMUM	1,000	. М	MUMIXA	10.000		-
VALID CASES	164	м	ISSING CAS	is o		

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q13 YEAR DEPARTED PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LAR	FL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
		76	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
		77	6	3.7	3.7	5.5
		78	18	11.0	11.ó	16.5
		79	20	12.2	12.2	28.7
		80	27	16.5	16.5	45.1
		81	31	18.9	18.9	64.0
		82	14	8.5	8.5	72.6
		89	1	0.6	0.6	73.2
		99	, 44	26.8	26.8	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	84.988	S	TD ERR	0 • 675	MEDIAN	80.758
MODE	99.000		TD DEV	8 • 639	VARIANCE	74.638
KURTÕSIS Hinimum	-0.960 76.900		AXIMUM AXIMUM	0.961 99.000	RANGE	23.000
VALID CASES	164		AISSING CAS	ES O		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

014 HIGHEST LEVEL JOB HELD PPBCS OFFICE

		CDDE	ABSOL FREQUE	UTE F	RELATIVE REQUENCY PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	-ME-UE	(aC). (PERCENT	(1 6 1 6 1 7	••••
ACTION OFFIC	ER	1	105	i	64.0	64.4	64.4
BRANCH-TEAM	05	2	35	;	21.3	21.5	85.9
TEAM-BR-OFF	06	3	23	3	14.0	14.1	100.0
OUT OF RANGE			1		0.6	MISSING	100.0
				-			
		TOTAL	164	•	100.0	100.0	
HEAN	1 • 4 9 7	s	TD ERR		0.057	MEDIAN	1 • 276
	1.000	_	TD DEV		0.732	VARIANCE	0.535
MODE			KENNESS	•	1.111	RANGE	2.000
KURTOSIS	-0.241	_) .		MANAGE	
RINIMUM	1.000	M	HUMIXA		3.000		
VALID CASES	163		ISSING	CASES	1		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

015 REASON FOR DEPARTURE FROM PPBES OFFICE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STILL ASSIGNED	1	44.	26.8	27.0	27.0
STAFF COLLEGE SCHOOL	2	1	0.6	0.6	27.6
SSC SCHOOL-PRIMARY	3	9	5.5	5.5	33.1
SSC SCHOOL-ALT	4	3	1.8	1.8	35.0
SSC SCHOOL-DEFERRED	5	4	2.4	2.5	37.4
05 COMMAND-PRIMARY	6	21	. 12.8	12.9	50.3
05 COMMAND-ALTERNATE	7	19	6.1	6.1	56.4
06 COMMAND-PRIMARY	8	5	3.0	3.1	59.5
DA STAFF-SECRETARIAT	10	10	6.1	6.1	65.6
OSD STAFF	11	7	4.3	4.3	69.9
nucs	12	2	1.2	1.2	71.2
TO RETIRE	13	6	3.7	3.7	74.8
TO RESIGN-PELEASE AC	14	1	0.6	0.6	75.5
OTHER - SEE COMMENTS	15	40	24.4	24.5	100.0
OUT OF RANGE		1	0.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 7.571	-	STD ERR	0.428	MEDIAN	6.476
MODE 1.000		TD DEV	5.469	VARIANCE	29.913
KURTOSIS -1.492		KENNESS	0.169	RANGE	14.000
MINIMUM 1.000	N	MUMIXA	15.000		
VALID CASES 163		ISSING CASE	S 1		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

016 ARMY NEEDS, WORKED IN DA PPBES BILLET

CATEGORY LAREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	. 4	2.4	2.4	2.4
13 TO 18 MONTHS	2	18	11.0	11•ŏ	13.6
19 TD 24 MONTHS	3	62	37.8	37.8	51.2
25 TO 30 MONTHS	4	25	15.2	15.2	66.5
51 TO 36 PONTHS	5	43	26.2	26.2	92.7
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	6	3.7	3.7	96.3
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	5	3.0	3.0	99.4
MORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.780	s	TO ERR	0 • 104	MEDIAN	3,468
NODE 3.000	S	TD DEV	1.334	VARIANCE	1.780
KURTOSIS 0.034		KEWNESS	0.441	RANGE	7.000
RINIMUM 1.000		MUMIXA	B.000		, , , ,
VALID CASES 164	M	ISSING CASES	6 0		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE 25 05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

017 ARMY NEEDS-SOME EXPERIENCE: PRO PARR POM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE		RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	2	.1 • 2	1.2	1.2
13 TO 18 HONTHS	2	1.3	7.9	7.9	9.1
19 TO 24 MONTHS	3	45	27.4	27.4	36.6
25 TO 30 WONTHS	4	29	17.7	17.7	54•3
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	61	37.2	37.2	91.5
37 TO 42 WONTHS	6	8	4.9	4.9	96.3
:3 TO 48 PONTHS	7	5	3.0	3.0	99.4
HORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 4.116	S	TD ERR	0 • 100	MEDIAN	4 • 259
MODE 5.000	_	TD DEV	1.279	VARIANCE	1.637
KURTOSIS -0.133		KENNESS	0.083	RANGE	7.000
RINIMUM 1.000		AXIMUM	8.000		- -
VALID CASES 164	N	ISSING CASES	0		

25-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-15-82

018 ARMY NEEDS-WORKED AT MAGON LEVEL ONLY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUT FREQUENC		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
13 TO 18 WONTHS	2	2	1.2	1.2	3.0
19 TO 24 MONTHS	3	29	17.7	17.7	20.7
25 TO 30 PONTHS	4	33	20.1	20.1	40.9
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	67	40.9	40.9	81.7
37 TO 42 PONTHS	6	19	11.0	11.0	92.7
43 TD 48 PONTHS	7	11	6.7	6.7	99.4
NORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 4.598	S	TO ERR	0 • 099	MEDIAN	4.724
MDDE 5.000	S	TD DEV	1.262	VARIANCE	1.592
KURTOSIS 0.357		KEWNESS	-0.167	RANGE	7.000
HINIMUM 1.000		AXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES 164	. м	ISSING CA	SES O		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

019 ARMY NEEDS-NO EXPERIENCE AT DA OR MACOM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	4	2.4	2.4	2.4
13 TO 18 WONTHS	2	1	0.6	0.6	3.0
19 TO 24 WONTHS	3	13	7.9	7.9	14.0
25 TQ 30 PONTHS	4	25	15.2	15.2	26.2
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	66	40 • 2	40.2	66.5
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	22	13.4	13.4	79.9
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	32	19.5	19.5	99.4
MORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 5-116	S	TD ERR	0 • 107	MEDIAN	5 • 0 9 1
MODE 5.000	s	TO DEV	1.372	VARIANCE	1.882
KURTOSIS 0.587		KEWNESS	-0.514	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM 1.000	_	AXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES 164	м	ISSING CASE	:s o		

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

1 INDIV NEEDS-WORKED IN DA PPBES BILLET

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	10	6.1	6.1	6.1
13 TO 18 MONTHS	2	30	18.3	18.3	24.4
19 TO 24 PONTHS	3	78	47.6	47.6	72.0
25 TD 30 MONTHS	4	17	10.4	10.4	82.3
21 TO 36 WONTHS	5	. 22	13.4	13.4	95.7
37 TO 42 FONTHS	6	3	1.8	1.8	97.6
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	3	1 • 8	1.6	99.4
PORE THAN 48	5	, <u> </u>	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.226	s	TU ERR	0.100	MEDIAN	3.038
MODE 3.000		TO DEV	1.279	VARIANCE	1 + 636
KURTOSIS 1.329		KEWNESS	0.886	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM 1.000	_	AXIMUM	8.000		, 1000
VALID CASES 164	м	ISSING CASES	. 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q21 INDIV NEEDS-SOME EXPERIENCE-PBG PARR POM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLU:E FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FRED (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	7	4.3	4.3	4.3
13 TO 18 MONTHS	2	26	15.9	15.9	20.1
19 TO 24 MONTHS	3	73	44.5	44.5	64.6
25 TO 30 MONTHS	4	29	17.7	17.7	82.3
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	22	13.4	13.4	95.7
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	3	1.3	1.8	97.6
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	3	1.8	1.8	99.4
HORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.360	s	TD ERR	0.097	MEDIAN	3.171
MDDE 3.000		TD DEV	1.238	VARIANCE	1.532
KURTOSIS 1.301		KEWNESS	0.798	RANGE	7.000
AINIMUM 1.000		AXIMUM	8.000	MANUE	7 9 0 0 0
VALID CASES 164	м	ISSING CASES	0		

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

022 INDIV NEEDS-WORKED AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY.	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	5	3.0	3.0	3.0
13 TO 18 MONTHS	2	13	7.9	7.ģ	11.0
19 TO 24 PONTHS	3	64	39.0	39.0	50.0
ES TO 30 MONTHS	4	30	18.3	18.3	68.3
31 TO 36 WONTHS	5	43	26.2	26•2	94.5
57 TO 42 WONTHS	6	4	2.4	2.4	97.0
43 TD 48 MONTHS	7	4	2.4	2.4	99.4
MORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.768	s	TD ERR	0 • 099	MEDIAN	3∙500
MODE 3.000	S	TO DEV	1.271	VARIANCE	1.615
KURTOSIS 0.358 RINIMUM 1.000	S	KEWNESS Aximum	0.390 8.000	RANGE	7.000
VALID CASES 164	м	ISSING CASES	. 0		

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

023 INDIV NEEDS-NO EXPERIENCE AT DA OR MACOM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE		RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	5	3.0	3.0	3.0
13 TO 18 WONTHS	2	5	3.0	3.0	6.1
19 TO 24 WONTHS	3	48	29.3	29.3	35.4
25 TO 30 MONTHS	4	36	22.0	22.0	57.3
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	53 .	32.3	32.3	89.6
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	8	4.9	4.9	94.5
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	8	4.9	4.9	99.4
MORE THAN 4R	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN 4.14	6 5	STD ERR	0.103	MEDIAN	4.167
HODE 5.00	00 9	STD DEV	1.316	VARIANCE	1.733
KURTOSIS 0.23		SKEWNESS	0.135	RANGE	7.000
RINIMUM 1.00		HUHIXAN	8.000	_	
VALID CASES 16	54 1	HISSING CASES	0		

95-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

024 ARMY: INDIV -WORKED IN DA PPBES BILLET

CATEGORY LANEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREO (PERCENT)
J2 MONTHS OR LESS	1	4	2.4	2.4	2.4
13 TO 18 WONTHS	2	23	14.0	14.0	16.5
19 TO 24 MONTHS	3	57	34.8	34.8	51.2
25 TO 30 MONTHS	4	35	21.3	21.3	72.6
21 TO 36 WONTHS	5	37	22.6	22.6	95 - 1
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	5	3.0	3.0	98.2
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
MORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 3.646	. s	TO ERR	0 • 0 9 8	MEDIAN	3+465
MODE 3.000) S	TD DEV	1.252	VARIANCE	1.567
KURTOSIS 0.223		KEWNESS	0.393	RANGE	7.000
RINIMUM 1,000	•	MUMIXA	6.000		. '
VALID CASES 164		ISSING CASES	. 0		

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q25 ARMY: INDIV -SOME EXPERIENCE-PBG PARR POM

CATEGORY LAREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	1	0.6	0.6	0.6
:3 TO 18 MONTHS	2	17	10.4	10.4	11.0
19 TO 24 MONTHS	3	54	32.9	32.9	43.9
25 TO 30 MONTHS	4	43	26.2	26.2	70.1
31 TO 36 MONTHS	. 5	39	23.8	23.8	93.9
37 TO 42 MONTHS	6	5	3.0	3.0	97.0
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	4	2.4	2.4	99.4
MORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.5	100.0	
NEAN 3.941	S	TD ERR	0.094	MEDIAN	3.733
MODE 3.000		TD DEV	1.208	VARIANCE	1.459
KURTOSIS 0.42		KEWNESS	0.521	RANGE	7.000
HINIMUM 1,000		AXIMUH	8.000		
VALID CASES 164	ь м	ISSING CASES	0		

25-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

026

ARMY: INDIV -WORKED AT MACOM LEVEL ONLY

CATEGORY LARE	L	COUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREG (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR	LFS5	1	1	0.6	0.6	0.6
13 TO 18 MONT	нѕ	2	7	4.3	4.3	4.9
19 TO 24 FONT	нѕ	3	37	22.5	22.6	27.4
25 TD 30 MONT	'HS	4	49	29.9	29.9	57.3
31 TD 36 MUNT	'HS	5	54	32.9	32.9	90.2
37 TO 42 MONT	'HS	6	9	5.5	5.5	95.7
43 TD 46 FONT	HS	7	6	3.7	3.7	99.4
HORE THAN 48		8	1	0.6	0.6	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
HEAN	4.244	s	TD ERR	0.092	MEDIAN	4 • 255
MODE	5.000	S	TU DEV	1.173	VARIANCE	1.376
PURTOSIS	0.393	S	KEWNESS	0.252	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	:.000	М	AXIMUM	8.000	·	
VALID CASES	164	М	ISSING CAS	es o		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PRES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE 35 25-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

027 ARMY: INDIV -NO EXPERIENCE AT DA OR MACOM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
12 MONTHS OR LESS	1	4	2.4	2.4	2.4
13 TO 18 WONTHS	2	5	3.0	3.0	5.5
19 TO 24 WONTHS	3	21	12.8	12.5	18.3
25 TO 30 MONTHS	,	46	28.0	28.ő	46.3
31 TO 36 MONTHS	5	61	37•2	37.2	83.5
37 TO 42 PONTHS	6	16	9.8	9.8	93.3
43 TO 48 MONTHS	7	10	6.1	6.1	99.4
HORE THAN 48	8	1	0.6	0.6	.100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN 4.51	2 9	TO ERR	0 • 100	MEDIAN	4.598
HODE 5.00	_	TO DEV	1.275	VARIANCE	1.626
KURTOSIS 0.63	•	KENNESS	-0.225	RANGE	7.000
RINIMUM 1,00		MUMIXA	8.000	3.2	-
VALID CASES 16	4 1	415 S ING CAS	ES 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

028 05 LEVEL COMMAND - PRIMARY SELECTION

CATEGORY LAREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	80	48.8	48.6	48.8
DISAGREE	2	42	25.6	25.6	74.4
NEUTRAL	3	6	3.7	3.7	78.0
AGREE	4	26	15.9	15.9	93.9
STRONGLY AGRFE	5	10	6.1	6.1	100.0
	TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN 2.04	9 s	TO ERR	0.102	MEDIAN	1 • 5 • 8
MODE J.CO	o s	70 DEV	1.310	VARIANCE	1.715
KURTOSIS -0.38		KENNESS	1.004	RANGE	4.000
HINIMUM 1.00	_	AXIHUM	5.000	· NITUE	4,000
VALID CASES 16	ь м	ISSING CASES	. 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

029

OS LEVEL COMMAND - ALTERNATE ACTIVATION

CATEGORY (LAREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY I	DIS. REE	1	71	43.3	43.3	43,3
DISAGREE		2	42	25.6	25.6	68.9
REUTRAL		3	8	4.9	4.9	73.8
*GREE		4	32	19.5	19.5	93.3
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	11	6.7	6.7	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.207	s	TO ERR	0.106	MEDIAN	1 • 762
MODE	1.000	S	TD DEV	1.354	VARIANCE	1.834
KURTOSIS	-0.873		KEWNESS	0.757	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	_	AXIMUM	5.000	.101146	44000
VALID CASI	ES 164	м	ISSING CASES	6 0		

PAGE 38

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

030 06 LEVEL COMMAND - PRIMARY SELECTION

CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	88	53.7	53.7	53.7
DISAGREE		2	32	19.5	19.5	73.2
REUTRAL		3	9	5.5	5.5	78.7
AGREE		4	22	13.4	13.4	92.1
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	13	7.9	7.9	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.024	s	TD ERR	0.106	MEDIAN	1 • 432
MODE	1.000	s	TO DEV	1.361	VARIANCE	1.852
KURTOSIS	-0.348		KEWNESS	1.049	RANGE	4.000
NINIMUM	1.000	_	AXIMUM	5.000	MANUE	44000
VALID CAS	ES 164	м	ISSING CASES	6 0		

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q31 Q6 LEVEL COMMAND - ALTERNATE ACTIVATION


CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	76	46.3	46.3	46.3
DISAGREE		2	35	21.3	21.3	67.7
REUTRAL		3	13	7.9	7.9	75.6
AGREE		4	26	15.9	15.9	91.5
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	14	8.5	8,5	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.189	S	TD ERR	0.108	MEDIAN	1.671
HODE	1.000	S	TD BEV	1.386	VARIANCE	1.921
KURTOSIS	-0.794	S	KEWNESS	0.803	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	М	AXIMUM	5.000	- -	. • • •
VALID CAS	ES 164	м	ISSING CASES	0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

332 STAFF COLLEGE LEVEL SCHOOLING

CATEGORY	LAREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	39	23.8	23.8	23.8
DISAGREE		2	27	16.5	16.5	40.2
HEUTRAL		3	29	17.7	17.7	57.9
#GREE		4	52	31.7	31.7	89.6
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	17	10.4	10.4	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN	2.884		TO ERR	0.106	MEDIAN	3.052
MODE	4.000	S	TO DEV	1.358	VARIANCE	1.845
KURTOSIS	-1.319	S	KEWNESS	-0.114	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1,000	M	AXIMUH	5.000		
VALID CAS	SES 164	м	ISSING CASE	s o		



05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

033 SSC LEVEL SCHOOLING -PRIMARY SELECTION

CATEGORY L	.AREL	'CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY D	ISAGREE	1	47	28.7	28.7	28.7
DISAGREE		2	40	24.4	24.4	53.0
REUTRAL		3	17	10.4	10.4	63.4
AGREE		4	44	26.8	26.8	90.2
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	16 	9.8	9.8	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	10 0 •ó	
PEAN	2,646	s	TD ERR	0 • 109	MEDIAN	2+375
MODE	1.000	S	TO DEV	1.391	VARIANCE	1.936
KURTOSIS	-1.372	S	KEVNESS	0.226	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1,000		AXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASE	ES 164	M	ISSING CASES			

95-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

SSC LEVEL SCHOOLING-ALTERNATE ACTIVATION 034

CATEGORY 1	.AREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE PREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY (ISAGREE	1	42	25.6	25.6	25.6
DISAGREE		2	39	23.8	23.8	49.4
NEUTRAL		3	20	12.2	12.2	61.6
AGREE		4	45	27.4	27.4	89.0
STRONGLY	AGREE	5 TOTAL	18 	11.0	11.0 100.0	100.0
MEAN MODE KURTOSIS RINIMUM	2.744 4.000 -1.369 1.000	S	TD ERR TD DEV KEWNESS AXIMUM	0 • 108 1 • 386 0 • 134 5 • 000	MEDIAN VARIANCE RANGE	2•550 1•922 4•000
VALID CASE	S 164		TSSING CASES			

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

035 SSC LEVEL SCHOOLING -BEFERRED ACTIVATION

CATEGORY L	.AREL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY		· ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY D	ISAGREE	1	40	24.4	24.4	24.4
DISAGREE		2	29	17.7	17.7	42.1
HEUTRAL		3	24	14.6	14.6	56.7
AGREE		4	48	29.3	29.3	86.0
STRONGLY A	GREE	5	23	14.0	14.0	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.909	s	TD ERR	0.111	MEDIAN	3.042
HODE	4.000		TD DEV	1.418	VARIANCE	2.010
KURTOSIS	-1.388		KEWNESS	-0.059	RANGE	4.000
HINIMUM	1.000		AXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASE	5 164	м	ISSING CAS	SES 0		

D5-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED OS-13-82

036 DA STAFF-SECRETARIAT

CATEGORY (AREL	CODE	ABSOLUT FREQUENC		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY (ISAGREE	1	13	7.9	7.9	7.9
DISAGREE		2	22	13.4	13.4	21.3
NEUTRAL		3	39	23.8	23.8	45.1
&GREE		4	56	34 • 1	34.1	79.3
STRONGLY	AGREE	5 Total	34 	20.7	20.7	100.0
		,		10000	10000	
MEAN Mode Kurtosis	3,463 4,000 -0,593	S	TO ERR To DEV Kevness	0 • 0 9 3 1 • 1 9 0 - 0 • 4 9 B	MEDIAN VARIANCE RANGE	3+643 1+416 4+000
RINIMUM VALID CASE	1.000		AXIMUM Issing ca	5.000 SES 0	-	

C5-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

037 OSD STAFF

CATEGORY	LAREL	CODE	ABSOL!	UTE FREQ	ATIVE UENCY CENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ {PERCENT}
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	14		8.5	8.5	8,5
DISAGREE		2	30	1	8.3	18.3	26.8
NEUTRAL		3	35	2	1.3	21.3	48.2
AGREE		4	54	3	2.9	32.9	81-1
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	31	1	8.9	18.9	100.0
		TOTAL	164	10	0.0	100.0	
MEAN	3.354	S	TD ERR	0.0	95	MEDIAN	3,556
RODE	4.000	S	TD DEV	1 • 2	22	VARIANCE	1.494
KURTOSIS	-0.865	-	KEWNESS			RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1,000	-	MUMIXA	5.0	00		
VALID CAS	SES 164	м	ISSING	GASES	0		

85-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

038 0JC5

CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLU' FREGUEN		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERGENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	. 14	8.5	8.5	8,5
DISAGREE		2	20	12.2	12.2	20.7
NEUTRAL		3	32	19.5	19.5	40.2
AGREE		4	61	37.2	37.2	77.4
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	37	22.6	22.6	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN	3.530	s	TD ERR	0 • 0 9 5	MEDIAN	3.762
MODE	4.000		TO DEV	1.211	VARIANCE	1.465
KURTOSIS	-0.501		KEWNESS	-0.629	RANGE	4.000
PINIMUM	1.000	_	AXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CAS	ES 164	м	ISSING C	ASES 0		

25-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

039 PERSONNEL TURN-OVER IN PPEES IS HIGH

CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE PREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	1	0.6	0.6	: 0.6
BISAGREE		2	16	9.8	9.8	10.4
REUTRAL		3	29	17.7	17.7	28.0
AGREE		4	87	53.0	53.0	81.1
STRONGLY	AGREE	5 Total	31 	18.9	18,9	100.0
			•04	100.0	100.0	
MEAN HODE Kurtosis Hinimum	3.799 4.000 0.178 1.000	S S	TD ERR TD DEV Kewness Aximum	0.069 0.880 -0.686 5.000	MEDIAN VARIANCE RANGE	3.914 0.775 4.000
VALID CASE	ES 164	M	ISSING CASES	. 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

040 OFFICERS IN PPBES ARE MBEST & BRIGHTESTM

CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREOUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FRED (PERCENT)
BISAGREE		2	13	7.9	8.0	■.0
REUTRAL		3	36	22.0	22.1	30.1
AGREE		4	83	50.6	50.9	81.0
STRONGLY AGR	EE	5	31	18.9	19.0	100.0
DUT OF RANGE			1	0.6	MISSING	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	3.810	s	TD ERR	Û+ 965	MEDIAN	3.892
RODE	4.000	S	TO DEV	0.836	VARIANCE	0+698
KURTOSIS	-0.201	S	KEWNESS	-0.464	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	5,000	_	AXIMUM	5.000	*******	24,900
VALID CASES	163	м	ISSING CASE	S 1		*

35-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

041 TASKS DONE ARE OFTEN FUSTRATING

CATEGORY L	AREL	CODE	ABSOLUTÉ FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY D	ISAGREE	1	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
DISAGREE		2	15	9.1	9.1	10.4
NEUTRAL		3	6	3.7	3.7	14.0
AGREE		4	67	40.9	40.9	54.9
STRONGLY A	GREE	5	74 	45.1	45.1	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4 • 195	s	TD ERR	0.075	MEDIAN	4.381
MODE	5.000	S	TD DEV	0.965	VARIANCE	0.931
KURTOSIS	1,351	s	KEWNESS	-1.355	RANGE	4,000
RINIMUM	1,000	_	AXIMUM	5.000	- Wide At	4,000
VALID CASES	5 164	м	ISSING CASES	0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-18-82

842 SKILL NEEDED MUST BE LEARNED ON THE JOB

CATEGORY L	ABFL	CODE	ABSOL FREQUE		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
DISAGREE		2	33	20.1 .	20.1	20.1
REUTRAL		3	14	8.5	8.5	28.7
AGREE		4	75	45.7	45.7	74.4
STRONGLY AG	GREE	5	42	25.6	25.6	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN	3.768	S	TD ERR	0.082	MEDIAN	3,967
HODE	4.000	S	TD DEV	1.049	VARIANCE	1.099
KURTOSIS	-0.821		KEWNESS		RANGE	3.000
AINIMUM	2,000	_	HUMIXA	5.000		34000
VALID CASES	S 164	M	ISSING	CASES 0		

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT OF PPBES PROGRAMMERS ON DA STAFF PAGE 51

05-13-82 FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

043 NOT IN JOB LONG ENOUGH TO BECOME EFFECTS

CATEGORY LA	BEL .	CODE	ABSOLU FREQUE		Y FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY DI	SAGREE	1	:5	3.0	3.0	3.0
DISAGRÉE		2	65	39.6	39.6	42.7
REUTRAL		3	36	22.0	22.0	64.6
AGREE		4	48	29.3	29.3	93.9
STRONGLY AG	REE	5	10	6+1	6•1	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
REAN	2.957	S	TD ERR	0.080	MEDIAN	2,833
HODE	2.000	_	TD DEV	1.029	VARIANCE	1.060
KURTOSIS	-1.022		KEWNESS		RANGE	4.000
RINIMUM	1.000		AXIMUM	5.000	- -	
VALIR CASES	164	M	ISSING (CASES 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

044 PPBES ACTIVITIES ARE WELL ORGANIZED

CATEGORY L	ABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY D	ISAGREE	1	23	14.0	14.0	14.0
DISAGREE		2	54	32.9	32.9	47.0
NEUTRAL		3	28	17.1	17.1	64.0
AGREE		4	55	33.5	33.5	97.6
STRONGLY A	GRFE	5	4	2.4	2.4	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
PEAN	2.774	s	TD ERR	0.088	MEDIAN	2•679
MODE	4.000	S	TO DEV	1.131	VARIANCE	1.280
KURTOSIS	-1.231		KEWNESS	-0.034	RANGE	4.000
RINIMUM	1.000		AXIMUM	5.000		40000
VALID CASE	s 164	м	ISSING CASE	s o		

MAS THEN_OVER MANY PRODUCTIVITY DIFFICULT

045 TI	JRN-UVER	MADE	PHUDUCTIVITY	DIFFICULT		•
CATEGORY LAI	REL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ {PERCENT}
STRONGLY DI	SAGREE	1	5	3.0	3.Ò	3.0
DISAGREE		2	59	36.0	36.0	39.0
REUTRAL		3	30	18.3	18.3	57.3
AGREE		4	60	36.6	36.6	93.9
STRONGLY AG	REE	5	10	6.1	6.1	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN Mode Kurtosis	3.067 4.000 -1.178		STD ERR STD DEV SKEWNESS	0.082 1.046 0.028	MEDIAN VARIANCE RANGE	3 • 1 0 0 1 • 0 9 4 4 • 0 0 0
RINIMUM VALID CASES	1,000		MAXIMUM MISSING CASE	5.000 S 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONARE - CREATED 05-13-82

046 WORKING ON DA STAFF IS REVARDING EXPER-

CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	12	7.3	7.3	7.3
PISAGREE		2	12	7.3	7.3	14.6
REUTRAL		3	15	9.1	9.1	23.8
AGREE		4	74	45.1	45.1	68.9
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	51	31.1	31.1	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	3.854	S	TD ERR	0.090	MEDIAN	4.081
MODE	4.000	S	TD DEV	1.158	VARIANCE	1.340
KURTOSIS	0 + 605	s	KEWNESS	-1.151	RANGE	4.000
RINIMUM	1,000		AXIMUM	5.000	MANUE	44000
VALID CAS	ES 164	м	ISSING CASE	s 0		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

Q47 CAN MAKE MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DA

CATEGORY	LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
STRONGLY	DISAGREE	1	6	3.7	3.7	3.7
DISAGREE		2	6	3.7	3.7	7.3
NEUTRAL		3	18	11.0	11•ő	18.3
AGREE		4	81	49.4	49.4	67.7
STRONGLY	AGREE	5	53	32.3	32.3	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4.030	S	TD ERR	0.075	MEDIAN	4.142
MODE	4.000	5	TD DEV	0.956	VARIANCE	0.913
KURTOSIS	2,098		KENNESS	-1.342	RANGE	4.000
DINIMUM	1.000	_	AAXIMUH	5.000		
VAL ID CA	cFC 164	,	AISSING CAS	es o		

25-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-15-82

048

COMMENTS RECEIVED

CATEGORY LAB	EL	CODE	ABSOLUT FREQUENC		ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ {PERCENT}
YES		1	83	50.6	50.9	50.9
NO		2	80	48.8	49.1	100.0
OUT OF RANGE		TOTAL	164	100.0	MISSING 100.0	100.0
MEAN MODE KURTOSIS RINIMUM	1.491 1.000 -2.024 1.000	S S	TO ERR To dev Kewness Aximum	0.039 0.501 0.037 2.000	MEDIAN VARIANCE RANGE	1•4 82 0•2 5 1 1•000
VALID CASES	163	м	ISSING CA	SES 1		

05-13-82

FILE - NONAME - CREATED 05-13-82

049 ERROR DETECTION

CATEGORY LAR	EL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES		1	65	39.6	39.6	39.6
80		2	. 99	60.4	60.4	100.0
		TOTAL	164	100.0	100.0	
HEAN MODE KURTOSIS AINIMUM	1.604 2.000 -1.840 1.000		STD ERR STD DEV SKEWNESS MAXIMUM	0.038 0.491 -0.428 2.000	MEDIAN Variance Range	1.672 0.241 1.000
VALID CASES	164	1	HISSING CAS	E S 0		

APPENDIX 4

REASONS FOR DEPARTURE FROM PPBES BILLET

DETAILS ON "OTHER" ASSIGNMENTS

APPENDIX 4

REASONS FOR DEPARTURE PROM PPBES BILLET

MILPERCEN Div Chief, (ap study) ODCSOPS Div Chief, Bn S3 ODCSOPS Dep Cdr., Contract Agcy	80	19-24 mos					
MILPERCEN (sp study) Div Chief, ODCSOPS Dep Cdr, Contract Agcy			20m 00-02	31-36 mos	37-42 mos	43-48 mos	
		TRADOC Sys Mgr ARNG Adv MILPERCEN Br Chief Dep Dir, Civil Works	Job unk	Dep Div Ch. DARCOM HQ Spt Comd IG Proj Mgr Course	DRC Cdr Adv, Saudi Arabia HQ, USARFUR	Dep Dist Engr Sr Army Adv MAC XO, Engr Gp	
P&B Div				HQ, USAREUR DOD Agency	MACOM Dep Compt	C, Fin Sec Def Comm Age:	
PAB Off OTEA	ĐƠ		HQ, Fifth USA	Other dir ICAF Instr/ Stu	COA	HQ, USARBUR	
Past Div			Europe				
PC Team DARCOM ODCSRDA	ir,	DMMC Cdr		Korea			

OPTIMAL TOUR LENGTH

MEANS TO MONTHS CONVERSION TABLE

MENN	MONTHS	MEAN	MONTES
2.683	16	3.750	26
2.167	16.5	3.833	26.5
2.250	17	3,917	27
2.333	17.5	4.999	27.5
2.417	18	4.983	28
2.500	18.5	4.167	28.5
2.583	19	4.250	29
2.667	19.5	4.333	29.5
2.758	28	4.417	30
2.833	20.5	4.500	30.5
2.917	21	4.583	31
3 .000	21.5	4.667	31.5
3.083	22	4.758	32
3.167	22.5	4.833	32.5
3.258	23	4.917	33
3.333	23.5	5.000	33.5
3.417	24	5.983	34
3.560	24.5	5.250	34.5
3.583	25	5.333	35
3.667	25.5	5.417	35.5
		5 .506	36

DISTRIBUTION

Commander, MILPERCEN 200 Stovall Street Alexandria, VA 22332

Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation Office, Chief of Staff, US Army Washington, DC 20301

Chief, Program and Budget Division ODCSPER ATTN: DAPE-MEB HQDA Washington, DC 20301

Chief, Program and Budget Office ODCSOPS ATTN: DAMO-ZF HQDA Washington, DC 20301

Chief, Program and Management Division ODCSLOG ATTN: DALO-RMP HQDA Washington, DC 20301

5.

Chief, Program Coordination Team ODCSRDA ATTN: DAMA-PPT HQDA Washington, DC 20301